SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTURAL INTERNSHIP

March 2000

CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS BOARD
Public protection through examination, licensure, and regulation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The California Architects Board (CAB) has been studying the appropriateness of a structured internship program as a requirement for licensure in California for some time. The goals of such a program would be to improve the competency of newly licensed architects and to facilitate licensing reciprocity for California architects.

CAB has determined that a logical approach to meet both of these goals would be to adopt the Intern Development Program (IDP) which is administered by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) and which is currently required in 44 other jurisdictions.

Prior to moving forward to adopt IDP in California, CAB wants to work with NCARB to ensure that all of the training conditions and administration requirements for IDP will work in California. To that end, CAB sought to gather information from its candidates to ensure their input is considered.

On January 5, 2000, CAB mailed out surveys to 2,734 California candidates who had applied for eligibility for the Architect Registration Examination (ARE). Responses were received from 614 candidates and the information gathered has been compiled in this document.

Following in this report are the following:

- SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS – This contains an overview of key results.

- CAB SURVEY STATISTICS – This contains a summary and comparison of all the responses by total, by those who had or were participating in IDP, and by those not involved in IDP.

- CAB IDP SURVEY – IDP PARTICIPATING RESPONDENTS – This contains the responses of those who had completed IDP or were participating in IDP. It includes the number who responded to each question, the percentage of each, and includes all the comments provided by that group.

- CAB IDP SURVEY – NON-IDP PARTICIPATING RESPONDENTS – This contains the responses of those who had completed or were earning credit for their non-IDP experience for California licensure. It includes numbers, percentages, and comments from that group.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

Candidate Profile

614 responses were received –

    44 (7% of respondents) had completed IDP.

    79 (13% of respondents) were participating in IDP.

    332 (54% of respondents) had completed their non-IDP experience for California licensure.

    159 (26% of respondents) were in the process of earning credit for non-IDP experience for California licensure.

Differences Between IDP and Non-IDP Respondents

There were some noticeable differences between the IDP and non-IDP respondents. Some of them were logical differences, others somewhat surprising.

Overall, IDP participants were more positive about aspects of IDP and its effects on their lives.

- IDP participants were more likely to plan on practicing in other states, but there was little difference in their plans to practice internationally.
- IDP participants were much more likely to indicate they had trouble contacting NCARB (76%) than non-IDP participants (11%).
- 66% of non-IDP participants thought IDP was a significant barrier to licensure, while 37% of IDP participants thought so.

Familiarity with IDP

- 92% of respondents had heard of IDP which was in stark contrast to the results of the CAB survey of licensed architects in 1997, a majority of whom were unfamiliar with IDP. Most respondents (50%) had learned about IDP in school.

Cost Concerns

- A large percentage of respondents were concerned about the costs of IDP. 76% thought IDP created unreasonable costs to the intern (59% of IDP participants and 80% of non-IDP participants).

How Does IDP Prepare Candidates

- While a significant number of respondents felt that IDP better prepared candidates to become a more competent and well-rounded architect (45%) and to practice in other states and countries (32%), only 23% thought it helped them pass the ARE.

Adopt IDP?

Results asking whether IDP should be adopted were all over the map.

- 30% thought IDP should be adopted as is as soon as possible (43% of IDP participants and 26% of non-IDP participants).

- 39% thought IDP should never be adopted (19% of IDP participants and 44% of non-IDP participants).
- 23% thought IDP should be adopted with changes (29% of IDP participants and 21% of non-IDP participants).

Training Settings

Under current IDP requirements, interns are limited to the number of training units they may earn under the direct supervision of an architect in an office where practice does not include each of the categories in the IDP Training Requirements.

- Nearly half (46%) of respondents thought that the training setting requirement that most IDP credit be earned in a traditional office offering all 16 training areas was a hindrance.
- 67% (76% of IDP participants and 65% of non-IDP participants)thought training units should be earned under the direct supervision of a licensed architect regardless of the work setting.

Duration Requirement

Under IDP conditions, intern must be employed at least 35 hours per week for a minimum period of 10 consecutive weeks or at least 20 hours per week for a minimum period of six (6) consecutive months.

- 25% thought the requirement was a hindrance.
- 38% thought the requirement was acceptable as is (56% of IDP participants thought it was acceptable, while 33% of non-IDP participants thought so).
- 21% of all participants thought the requirement should be eliminated, while 7% thought it should be amended.

614 Respondents

Not all responses equal 100% if respondent did not answer all questions.

Candidate Profile

1. Please describe your current internship status.		TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
I have completed IDP.		7%	7%	n/a
I am participating in IDP.		13%	13%	n/a
I have completed (non-IDP) experience for California licensure.		54%	n/a	54%
I am earning credit for (non-IDP) experience for California licensure.		26%	n/a	26%
None of the above.		n/a	n/a	n/a
2. What is your examination status?				
I have completed the ARE (Architect Registration Examination).		6%	7%	5%
I am in the process of taking the ARE.		82%	84%	82%
I have not yet begun the ARE.*		12%	9%	13%
I do not plan to take the ARE.*		0%	0%	0%
3. Do you plan to practice outside California?	YES	63%	83%	58%
	NO	30%	12%	34%
‣ **In other states?**	YES	63%	83%	58%
	NO	21%	12%	24%
‣ **Internationally?**	YES	36%	38%	35%
	NO	38%	39%	38%
4. Have you had any difficulty contacting				
‣ **CAB?**	YES	5%	2%	5%
	NO	86%	89%	85%
‣ **NCARB?**	YES	24%	76%	11%
	NO	67%	20%	79%

Your Current Job

5. How long have you worked for your current firm?	average:	2 y 11 m	2 y 3 m	3 y 2 m
6. On average, how many hours per week do you work?	average:	44.1 hrs	44.5 hrs	44 hrs

		TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
7. **Do you work under the direct supervision of a licensed architect?**	YES	88%	93%	86%
	NO	12%	6%	13%

8. Please describe your current employment status with your firm.

	TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
I am a full-time, permanent employee.	87%	91%	86%
I am a part-time, permanent employee.	1%	2%	1%
I am a temporary employee.	0%	0%	0%
I am an intermittent employee.	0%	0%	0%
I am a contracted consultant or other contracted position.	4%	0%	5%
I am the employer.	2%	0%	3%
I am in partnership with an architect.	2%	2%	2%
None of the above.	0%	1%	

		TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
9. **Does your firm's practice cover all of the 16 areas in the IDP Training Requirement?**	YES	69%	79%	67%
	NO	25%	18%	27%
10. **Does your firm participate in IDP?**	YES	19%	46%	12%
	NO	74%	48%	81%

If no, do you think your firm/supervisor would actively participate in IDP? (Please check only one.)

	TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
If an intern asked them to	27%	33%	26%
Only if it were mandatory	22%	11%	25%
Do not know	26%	12%	30%

Your Exposure to/Opinion About IDP

		TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
11. **Had you previously heard of IDP?**	YES	92%	96%	91%
	NO	8%	3%	9%

12. Where did you learn about IDP?

	TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
In school	50%	79%	43%
From a friend	12%	6%	14%
From a supervisor/firm	7%	6%	7%
From a professional association	20%	12%	22%
From the California Architects Board	24%	5%	29%
Other	5%	8%	5%

		TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
13. **Are you familiar with the 16 training areas contained in the IDP Training Requirement?**	YES	79%	98%	74%
	NO	20%	1%	24%

	TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
14. Based on your knowledge of IDP, do you think IDP would (check as many as you think apply)			
Create an unreasonable barrier to getting your architect license.	60%	37%	66%
Unreasonably increase costs to you.	76%	59%	80%
Unreasonably increase costs to your firm/supervisor.	44%	16%	51%
15. Compared to less structured internships, do you think IDP <u>better</u> prepares candidates (check as many as you think apply)			
To take and pass the ARE.	23%	37%	20%
To take and pass the California Supplemental Examination.	12%	16%	11%
To become a more competent, well-rounded architect.	45%	63%	40%
To become more marketable to a firm/employer.	26%	42%	22%
To practice in other states and countries.	32%	50%	28%
Other	3%	7%	2%
16. Adoption of IDP by CAB, to include an exemption (or grandfathering) for any candidate currently in the exam process with the Board, should (check only one)			
Happen as soon as possible with no changes to IDP.	30%	43%	26%
Never happen.	39%	19%	44%
Happen with the following changes to IDP:	23%	29%	21%

Training Settings

For the next two sections, please complete your responses based on your actual experiences if you are participating in IDP or have completed IDP, and based on your anticipated experiences had you participated in or completed IDP.

Under IDP conditions, interns are limited to the number of training units they may earn in a training setting that does not encompass all of the 16 training areas contained in the IDP Training Requirement. CAB is interested in your experience with or your opinion about this condition and its effect on your internship.

17. Did you ever or would you ever have had to turn down an employment opportunity or leave an organization solely because the time allowed in a training setting had been "maxed out"?		TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
	YES	29%	27%	30%
	NO	46%	72%	40%

		TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
18. Did you have or would you have had any internship training in a setting that could not be counted toward IDP because the maximum allowed time in that setting had been exceeded?	**YES**	43%	63%	39%
	NO	30%	37%	28%
19. Was this condition or would this condition have been a hindrance to completing your internship?	**YES**	46%	48%	45%
	NO	27%	50%	21%
20. Do you believe training units should be able to be earned for experience within any of the IDP Training Requirement areas if it is received under the direct supervision of a licensed architect <u>regardless</u> of the work setting?	**YES**	67%	76%	65%
	NO	10%	18%	8%

Duration Requirement

Under IDP conditions, interns must be employed at least 35 hours per week for a minimum period of 10 consecutive weeks or at least 20 hours per week for a minimum period of six (6) consecutive months. This is the "duration requirement."

		TOTAL	IDP	NON-IDP
21. Was this requirement or would this requirement have been a hindrance to completing your internship?	**YES**	25%	28%	25%
	NO	56%	72%	52%
22. In your opinion, the duration requirement (check only one)				
Is acceptable as is.		38%	56%	33%
Should be eliminated.		21%	15%	23%
Should be amended.		7%	14%	6%
At least 20 hours per week for a minimum period of 10 consecutive weeks.		8%	11%	7%
Other, please specify		4%	3%	4%

123 Respondents

Candidate Profile

1. Please describe your current internship status.

I have completed IDP.	44 (36%)
I am participating in IDP.	79 (64%)
I have completed (non-IDP) experience for California licensure.	n/a
I am earning credit for (non-IDP) experience for California licensure.	n/a
None of the above.	n/a
Please explain _____	

COMMENTS

- I moved to CA in June and have been accumulating credit outside IDP since then.
- I have completed the training part of IDP, but since I don't have a professional degree, I will ever officially complete it.
- Almost finished – only a few more hours of community service.
- I only completed IDP because it was obvious to me that if I did not I would encounter manufactured barriers to the licensing process.
- I have only 5 units left.
- I used to work in Georgia where it is required.
- Participation pending requested application materials presently being evaluated for NCARB IDP file. California experience not accepted by NCARB – occurred before professional degree at accredited university.
- I have satisfied and documented all required IDP, but have not submitted paperwork.
- And I have yet to receive a progress report after 1 year.
- IDP in Ontario, Canada.
- I live in Florida and IDP is not by choice. If it was, I feel it's a waste of effort in trying to push 16 training areas on an employer. You're lucky to have a job with little experience to begin with.
- I may have completed!
  It is very unclear to know what is the ultimate requirement of IDP. Is it 700 units or 35 hours/week for 10 consecutive weeks minimum?
- Started and completed significant portion of IDP, but lost momentum upon receiving eligibility in California for ARE.

2. What is your examination status?

I have completed the ARE (Architect Registration Examination).	9 (7%)
I am in the process of taking the ARE.	103 (84%)
I have not yet begun the ARE.*	11 (9%)
I do not plan to take the ARE.*	0 (0%)
* Please explain why _____	

3. Do you plan to practice outside California? **Y** 102 (83%) **N** 18 (12%)

    ▸ **In other states?** **Y** 102 (83%) **N** 15 (12%)

    ▸ **Internationally?** **Y** 47 (38%) **N** 48 (39%)

4. Have you had any difficulty contacting

    ▸ **CAB?** **Y** 3 (2%) **N** 109 (89%)

    ▸ **NCARB?** **Y** 94 (76%) **N** 25 (20%)

If Yes, please explain _____

COMMENTS

CAB

There were no comments relating to only CAB – See Both below.

NCARB

- Good info on website – People who answer phone are not very knowledgeable.

- It is hard to get other than voice mail @ NCARB. When you do get a person to ask a question of, it is not unusual to be transferred many times or be given another phone number to call entirely.

- It takes forever to get a response from them to both mail & voice mail messages. I have never spoken to a person the first time I called on an issue.

- When I leave my name & phone number as requested, they rarely return my call.

- I have had several frustrating and time-consuming experiences with billing problems as a result of scheduling/taking ARE exams.

- It is difficult to schedule exams and get answers to questions.

- NCARB is/has been fairly unreliable in forwarding information in a timely and professional manner. They charge a lot of money for very little service. I lost months waiting and contacting NCARB on a regular basis to determine and understand my eligibility status.

- I am completing IDP because it was required in Michigan. Since moving to California, I have decided to finish with IDP, even though not required because I am almost finished. Contacting NCARB has proven to be <u>very</u> difficult when I have had a problem that needs to be resolved. For the first year, they never sent me a training report to record my hours, but promptly sent me a bill!

- NCARB is difficult to deal with and their response time is <u>very</u> poor.

- Nobody is available except for answering machine/voice mail.

- I always get an answering machine.

- NCARB staff doesn't seem very knowledgeable.

- I called to question why some work experience had not been listed; gave up due to long waits; sent a letter and never heard back.

- They are very slow returning phone calls.

- Hard to reach (pinpoint) the person who can actually answer a particular question. Often get bounced around the phone system. I've left a message for a call back and never receive one back.

- I often get through to someone's voice mail which is frustrating when you need an answer before you can sign up to take the test. I've found, though, that if I persist, I can eventually get through to an actual person. NCARB staff is more professional than say 5 or more years ago. I attribute this to their receptionist, Delores, who is courteous and helpful.

- NCARB usually takes 2 weeks to return messages by phone. They seem to be under staffed and not familiar with their own regulations and standards.

- I have tried 4 times to talk to <u>the</u> person in charge of NCARB/ARE exams in the East Coast and left 4 messages on his voice mail, but he never responded (in a period of 2 weeks). My question was in regards to the Pre-Design exam, unfair judging, and unrelated comments.

Both

- Difficult phone system, so many different phone numbers. NCARB in particular acts like they are doing you a favor simply by talking to you.
- I always get voice mail and return phone calls many days after.
- It is difficult to reach a person, as both CAB and NCARB use voice mail/answering systems. When messages are left, calls are not returned or they are returned up to 72 hours later.
- The only difficulty is who or which phone number and department to contact for specific questions.

Your Current Job

5. How long have you worked for your current firm?   average   2 y 3 m

6. On average, how many hours per week do you work?   average   44.5 hrs

7. Do you work under the direct supervision of a licensed architect?   **Y** 115 (93%)   **N** 7 (6%)

8. Please describe your current employment status with your firm.

I am a full-time, permanent employee.	113 (91%)
I am a part-time, permanent employee.	2 (2%)
I am a temporary employee.	
I am an intermittent employee.	
I am a contracted consultant or other contracted position.	
I am the employer.	
I am in partnership with an architect.	3 (2%)
None of the above.	1 (1%)

  Please explain _____

9. Does your firm's practice cover all of the 16 areas in the IDP Training Requirement?   **Y** 97 (79%)   **N** 22 (18%)

10. Does your firm participate in IDP?   **Y** 56 (46%)   **N** 59 (48%)

If no, do you think your firm/supervisor would actively participate in IDP? (Please check only one.)

If an intern asked them to	40 (33%)
Only if it were mandatory	14 (11%)
Do not know	15 (12%)

Your Exposure to/Opinion About IDP

11. Had you previously heard of IDP? **Y** 118 (96%) **N** 4 (3%)

12. Where did you learn about IDP?

In school	97 (79%)
From a friend	7 (6%)
From a supervisor/firm	7 (6%)
From a professional association	15 (12%)
From the California Architects Board	5 (5%)
Other	10 (8%)

COMMENTS

- Previous state (Oregon).
- Some guy from AIA or maybe CAB came to UC Berkeley to give a presentation & scared us all into signing up.
- NCARB information session at UC Berkeley as an undergraduate.
- I participated in IDP since graduation.
- From previous employer.
- I went to school outside of California.
- State of Georgia.
- Other state boards – required for reciprocity.
- Mandatory in Ontario, Canada.
- I attended Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. They started telling us about IDP in our 2 nd or 3 rd year, which I felt was kind of late to receive that important information.
- Undergraduate, not graduate.
- From this notice.

13. Are you familiar with the 16 training areas contained in the IDP Training Requirement? **Y** 121 (98%) **N** 1 (1%)

14. Based on your knowledge of IDP, do you think IDP would (check as many as you think apply)

Create an unreasonable barrier to getting your architect license.	45 (37%)
Unreasonably increase costs to you (see attached fee information).	73 (59%)
Unreasonably increase costs to your firm/supervisor.	20 (16%)

COMMENTS

Barrier to Getting Your Architect License

- Somewhat.
- Very unreasonable.
- 2 years and 8-10 months more time needed.

Increase Costs to You

- <u>Absolutely</u>.
- Very much.
- <u>Definitely</u>.

Increase Costs to Your Firm

- Only if they covered it!

None

- It's difficult not to become cynical about the ability and intent of NCARB. A few times, there have been glaring mathematical errors on my unit reports (like 4.25 TU + 2 TU = 40.5 TU).
- No – It's great!
- It's kind of expensive.

---

15. **Compared to less structured internships, do you think IDP <u>better</u> prepares candidates (check as many as you think apply)**

To take and pass the ARE.	45 (37%)
To take and pass the California Supplemental Examination.	20 (16%)
To become a more competent, well-rounded architect.	78 (63%)
To become more marketable to a firm/employer.	52 (42%)
To practice in other states and countries.	61 (50%)
Other	8 (7%)

<u>COMMENTS</u>

To Take and Pass the ARE

- NO.

To Take and Pass the California Supplemental Examination

- Not familiar with content of test.
- Don't know.

To Become More Marketable to Firm

- Not just IDP but practice also.

To Practice in Other States

- Only because it is required in other states.

Other / None

- None of the above.
- To establish professional relationships outside the firm.
- To make your firm more accountable to expose interns to entire range of profession.
- The best thing is it gives you a bargaining chip as an intern to help increase the range of your duties.
- IDP only "allows" you the option of registration in IDP-required states.

- None of the above. IDP is a self-motivated step, not necessarily an educational process. The interns generate that themselves.
- I feel the IDP program is unnecessary! It is expensive, time consuming, mandates completion prior to being eligible to test, and really has no bearing on becoming a competent architect!
- None of the above.
- I do not know enough about other internships to comment.
- If completed properly – Yes to the above marked.
- To enter professional practice with the experience necessary to further the profession.
- I don't think IDP "better" prepares for anything. Architecture is an ongoing learning process and putting time and quantity to it limits the ability for people to get registered.
- No question, it makes a big, positive difference.
- I've no choice because other states had already implemented it. If I don't take IDP, I can't practice in other states.
- It can offer leverage towards getting more varied work experience in a firm.
- It gives interns leverage in pressing employers to give more diversified experience.
- I think that it depends.
- I am unaware of any other internship programs for comparison to IDP.
- IDP does set a minimum standard for reciprocity.
- Only because other states require it.
- IDP doesn't affect the way firms use their interns.

16. **Adoption of IDP by CAB, to include an exemption (or grandfathering) for any candidate currently in the exam process with the Board, should (check only one)**

Happen as soon as possible with no changes to IDP.	53 (43%)
Never happen.	23 (19%)
Happen with the following changes to IDP: _____	36 (29%)
Comments _____	

COMMENTS

Happen as Soon as Possible With No Changes to IDP

- I do feel you should grandfather all interns. It is an arduous enough process without adding more to it.
- Even though I have not passed all parts of the ARE yet, I feel that I have more than enough experience to perform in the roll of a P.A. – Questions on the test, like who invented the elevator, have no bearing on performing my job. I wish someone would create an exam that deals with real on-the-job problems!
- IDP is a good program and helps establish a standard for the practice.
- IDP is a good thing! It insures interns don't get "pigeon-holed" and get exposure to all elements of practice.
- IDP should consider outside U.S. experience for the individual to qualify in the process of obtaining the ARE.
- Please encourage AIA members to help their interns fulfill IDP.

- I think IDP is a useful tool to open the many facets of the architecture profession. Also community service emphasizes the character of the professional. I believe it is a good tool to structure the learning of the profession as an introduction, but IDP lacks the specificity needed to prepare an intern for the exam.

- Either accept IDP <u>fully</u> (and work with them to improve it) or do not accept at all.

- IDP should have some requirement that encourages interns to be exposed to local/state environmental, legal, professional regulations that are particular to that state – similar to what the California oral exam aims to do. To apply a broad brush national exam/internship requirement ignores the particular needs of the localities.

- Candidates who have already begun testing <u>and passed</u> at least one exam should not be subject to newly imposed IDP requirements.

- Anybody and everybody should be able to receive certification within 5-8 years of experience. Beyond that, they are not a devoted architect.

Never Happen

- **This is a plea: Please <u>don't</u> adopt IDP!!**
  I strongly disagree with making IDP mandatory to obtaining a license. My current state (IL) requires it. I have not received a single benefit from NCARB and they have a price tag on everything so far totaling $565 which doesn't include my time spent on their paperwork.

- IDP is an extraneous, bureaucratic, money-sucking process tethering our already weakened profession. The intention may be correct, but I do not feel it's of value relative to its costs – "interns" do not make enough salary to compensate for the costs associated with becoming licensed.

- I have found IDP nothing more than record keeping organization that charges <u>extremely</u> unreasonable fees. I believe it to be <u>useless</u>.

- <u>FEE DECREASES</u>.
  IDP should be an option and encouraged but <u>not</u> required.

- You must require a 5-year NAAB degree to participate in IDP, NCARB, and licensure.

- IDP is a joke. It costs people money and time. No other profession creates such a barrier to prompt licensure. We should be able to get out of school, take the exam, and get licensed.

- I think the system is fine the way it is now. Training should be optional, but training is valuable to the student.

- I don't believe the majority of interns in IDP are gaining from the experience. It does not affect their activities in the workplace. Fulfillment of IDP is either coincidence or falsified.

Happen With the Following Changes to IDP

- There needs to be a process of education for CA employers about aiding interns with requirements. Doing IDP in CA as is is very difficult. (To get categories met.) Costs are also too high.

- IDP = Psychological Barrier!
  - Restructuring of value unit requirements to be more consistent (<u>realistic</u>) based on breadth of experience entrusted to interns in a litigious profession!
  - The ARE indicates professional competency (or potential). If a candidate isn't prepared after 3-5 years of <u>professional experience</u>, the test results will be indicative.

- We should be able to begin taking ARE upon graduation from an accredited university (as it is now). I think that IDP should be required for licensure. IDP and ARE should be able to "run" concurrently.

- Cheaper!

- IDP creates barriers for anyone who is involved with non-traditional allied professions (i.e., construction management). IDP is biased towards traditional practice, regardless of the anecdotal evidence that non-traditional candidates may be better qualified for licensing by their experience.

- With changes in the way NCARB operates. NCARB needs to be more straightforward & less bureaucratic.

- Major reorganization within NCARB. I've been pretty dissatisfied with them on the whole, including their administration of the ARE (and Sylvan) – but that's another story. By the way, everyone gripes about the Volunteer requirement for IDP, but I think it is an EXCELLENT requirement. It would help, though, if NCARB provided a list of some possible volunteer opportunities, such as contacts at the National Park Service, Habitat for Humanity, or a community development agency.

- Allow people the choice (as it is now) but do away with the supplemental exam. You shouldn't have the worst of both worlds – i.e., additional IDP requirements and additional oral exam – It is unfair.

- Unless California begins to require a professional degree to obtain licensure, then IDP should not require a professional degree. The education clause should be eliminated. I don't believe comparing one year of school to practicing 10 years as a licensed architect is reasonable either. Note also that one of the largest (and best) architecture programs in California at UC Berkeley is not a professional degree, thereby eliminating many new graduates from completing IDP with this clause.

- Continue to allow interns to take ARE while participating in IDP. Do not make IDP completion mandatory for ARE. IDP does not help prepare interns for ARE. IDP should only be a requirement for licensure.

- More involvement required by the employer to stay included throughout the IDP process.

- Reduce the fees!!
  Interns have to pay enough just to take the ARE. Adding $300-700 more is ludicrous. Interns are grossly underpaid as it stands now. I truly fear for the future of our profession. Every issue of current journals have articles about young architects turning away for alternative careers that are more financially awarding. It's no wonder. Also, the majority of architecture firms do not pay for the ARE – I'm sure they would not pay for IDP either.

- Structure the credits around the same method the firms use to record time spent on phases of work. The task of compiling hours in 16 different areas is daunting and leads to fraudulent records of estimating.

- Previous work experience qualified for the exam requirements would be a substitute to the IDP requirements.

- Some requirements are difficult to obtain. I think the ability to take the exam over the 2.5 years prior to the oral exam is a great aspect of the current California system. While IDP will facilitate easier reciprocity in other states, it is a lot of effort/paperwork with a minimal benefit.

- California firms (actually all firms) should be able to receive support to ensure that mentors are trained and available to contribute to a positive IDP experience. More support from local AIA chapters to remove mystique from mentoring responsibilities.

- Allow work experience earned before receiving an accredited degree to count. Also, allow candidates with substantial work experience (10+ years) to count that in lieu of a degree.

- Use IDP only for licensure by reciprocity for architects who are licensed in other states. Keep current CAB criteria for ARE eligibility for non-licensed individuals in the architecture profession.

- Based on discussions with other associate architects and architects as well as review of the comments in the NCARB newsletter as well as my own experiences, meeting all criteria for IDP can be very difficult for candidates. Not all participants are sympathetic to the "student" enrolled in IDP (for a variety of reasons) and not all practices allow a "student" exposure to all areas in order to meet the criteria.

- Better monitoring. (There is no reason anyone should cheat on IDP requirements – they are not that demanding.) And CHEAPER FEES.

- I feel that IDP should have more focus in the areas of business and law related to architectural practice.
  People within their beginnings in architectural practice, I feel, have little exposure to business and law aspects if they are an employee. Perhaps the expansion of Training Area 15, Office Management, would help to remedy this situation.

- Construction and Administration and Management categories: Many of my peers have had and currently are struggling with experience in these areas because the structure of their firms does not give them the opportunity and, therefore, completing the program is only possible if they leave the firm they are happy at.
  If is often difficult to accurately account for the time spent in areas and seems I spend a lot of time in the office trying to account for my hours honestly.

- Educate employers as to how to mentor someone through the program. One fee at the end would be easier than establishing and maintaining a record throughout.

- The paperwork is a hassle. There are more urgent things to do than sit and discuss IDP with supervisor. It is difficult to find a mentor outside my firm because there is no network set up for it.
  It seems strange that I need 8 years of education/work when lawyers need 3 years of school and make twice as much money. But that's a whole other story.

- No fees annually.
  Less regulation.
  Less paperwork.
  Those full-color manuals are <u>worthless</u>. Black-and-white on plain paper. NCARB – cut your costs!
  Also, I do not get any information that is requested.

- IDP should not be mandatory, instead it should be voluntary.
  Adopting IDP and requiring it in order to take the ARE will delay the exam process even longer. This may discourage lots of people from taking the ARE.

- Investigation into the issue of a minimum length of time for internship.
  The possibility of lowering fees.

- Exemption should be given to those who passed ARE but not oral, because it may take years to pass.

- A new structure, more simplified, for calculating and measuring experience.

- Students in architecture need to be informed <u>as</u> <u>freshmen</u> of the NCARB requirements to become a licensed architect: NAAB degree, years of education, years of work experience with an architect, etc. IDP should be a help, not a hindrance, toward licensure. I feel it is a help; however, students must know about it in advance of graduation in order to fully grasp its importance.

- More reasonable and realistic requirements for certification and to be less costly.

- A candidate currently in the process of taking the exams should not be affected at all. They should continue to proceed with the exam and finish without any barriers.

- Not now.
  - Give people credit for over 40 hours a week.
  - IDP should not be only route to license. Maybe 5 years unstructured = 3 years IDP or something.
  I am in IDP because I will probably move back to the East Coast and need reciprocity.

- CAB should encourage interns to take the exam. IDP creates a barrier for interns! They should be allowed to <u>begin</u> the exam while doing IDP because preparing for the exam takes time. Many interns I know don't have time to do both. Once you've begun taking the exam, you'll feel better about the requirements of IDP. I think IDP requirements are too extreme and unrealistic!

- I believe candidates should be allowed to take the exam during the IDP process, immediately after completion of the accredited degree. That is what I am doing now and it works well, especially because the IDP program does not seem to focus on ARE topics – nowhere in the IDP requirement minimum hours is there a focus on mechanical/electrical/plumbing, structures, etc.

None

- No comment except why should those that are qualified and competent be excluded from practicing.

- It was suggested at the AIA National Convention that an Architect-In-Training testing and internship program be modeled after the Engineer-In-Training (EIT) program. I believe this is a valid concept; it permits the testing of architectural theory and history, etc. fundamental upon completing education, followed by testing of profession, processes, and practice after several years of unstructured professional supervision.

- I don't think candidates should have to have a professional degree. I think the apprenticeship method should be allowed (with the appropriate years required) in lieu of an actual degree.
- I believe the entire licensing process is excessively expensive in respect to the average salary made or anticipated by young architects. IDP is just part of the problem.
- Adopted but not mandatory. Those who wish to do their best and be marketable will do so.
- Probably should happen but should become part of the exam process with no additional cost to interns and requirements need to be revised (come on, Office Management? – nobody would let an intern manage an office).

Training Settings

For the next two sections, please complete your responses based on your actual experiences if you are participating in IDP or have completed IDP, and based on your anticipated experiences had you participated in or completed IDP.

Under IDP conditions, interns are limited to the number of training units they may earn in a training setting that does not encompass all of the 16 training areas contained in the IDP Training Requirement. CAB is interested in your experience with or your opinion about this condition and its effect on your internship.

17. **Did you ever or would you ever have had to turn down an employment opportunity or leave an organization solely because the time allowed in a training setting had been "maxed out"?**   **Y** 33 (27%)   **N** 89 (72%)

COMMENTS

Yes

- Or it was not under supervision of registered architect.
- It is a possibility in the future.

No

- I would have quit IDP.
- But I have just accepted that I will take much longer to finish IDP.
- Everyone is very "creative" in unit points distribution.

18. **Did you have or would you have had any internship training in a setting that could not be counted toward IDP because the maximum allowed time in that setting had been exceeded?**   **Y** 77 (63%)   **N** 45 (37%)

COMMENTS

Yes

- CD & DD units get filled pretty quickly.
- I expect to have extra credits in some areas.

No

- Although time could not be counted as it did not meet <u>minimum</u> employment requirements.

19. **Was this condition or would this condition have been a hindrance to completing your internship?** **Y** 59 (48%) **N** 61 (50%)

<u>COMMENTS</u>

Yes

- It increases the length of internship time, unless you lie.
- To completing my IDP.
- No office I've worked in (4) allows interns to participate in all areas of work which are part of IDP. They don't care about IDP or the interns' learning as much as their own business.

No

- This may slightly extend my internship period; however, the benefits of IDP are worth it.

None

- Architects will get screwed during a recession when they will take any job that they can get. Medical internship comes with a guarantee of a job.

20. **Do you believe training units should be able to be earned for experience within any of the IDP Training Requirement areas if it is received under the direct supervision of a licensed architect <u>regardless</u> of the work setting?** **Y** 93 (76%) **N** 22 (18%)

Comments

<u>COMMENTS</u>

Yes

- This is assuming the work being done is architecture and not construction or another related field.
- These categories should be <u>guidelines</u>. My completion of IDP will be delayed by 1 – 1-1/2 years. Because "on-site const. admin" work is handled by a separate department of the firm and it is difficult for me to participate frequently.
- My education and experience have given me what I need to become a qualified licensed architect. Being able to document all the hours of experience does nothing other than prove I keep good records.
- I previously worked in a design/build company under an architect. IDP only allowed me to gain credit for certain activities because we were a general contractor even though I regularly practiced in all 16 areas of IDP credit.
- Architects today practice in many settings which would not be considered "traditional" practice, i.e., for hospitals, government agencies, etc.
- This question is unclear. YES-I think.
- Not sure what you're getting at here, but assume you are referring to a more liberal IDP process.
- Anyone working under a licensed architect should be eligible to receive credit towards IDP. Due to the nature of the profession, mostly with smaller firms, limiting the work setting would hinder many participants' ability to complete IDP.
- Training units should also be earned for full amount of time not under direct supervision of licensed architect, but under supervision of licensed contractor or engineer as long as involved in building trades.
- Specifically, trainees who are working under contract (rather than as permanent employees) should not be penalized.

- This is difficult to answer as all areas of the IDP are really necessary for an intern to become a competent, professional architect. In the real setting though, intern experience in a "normal" practice setting is not always possible.

- There are so many venues in which to learn about the professional practice of architecture and an office setting seems very restrictive.

- A time limit of 6-month duration should be kept to better show how projects evolve over time.

- But in any scenario, anybody can sign off a training unit for anything – who really checks?

- Any exposure to training is a benefit to each student working under an architect.

- For people in the other training settings, perhaps supplemental education could be more formalized. This way, people could gain the necessary experience they need much faster and maybe even in a better way.

- Would have to cover the first part of the requirements (Design and Construction Documents) – Important – Minimum – and the Construction and Administration part of the requirements.

- The traditional "setting" which architects do what they do is evolving. The training requirements should reflect this and not be limited to traditionally assumed "settings."

- I work under the direct supervision of a licensed architect, but am hired as a "consultant" so his one-person firm does not have to deal with employer taxes, etc. IDP objects to this arrangement even though I am under direct supervision – my "consultant" status implies I am not under supervision.

- It doesn't make sense. Architecture is such a varied profession and each firm practices in a different way. There is no need to pigeon-hole people into certain types of firms.

- I do not believe it reasonable to expect a firm to pick and choose its projects based on its interns' needs for IDP credit. These subjects can be learned in other ways.

- Large firms may be difficult to achieve the marketing aspect of the program.

No

- I think you should have to work under the direct supervision of an architect in an architectural firm.

- Because then what is the point of having IDP if not to receive a broad range of experience.

- Training units should be only for activities related to professional practice.

- They should be earned in an architect office.

- Interns are normally/mostly put in the "production department." It is very difficult to get exposure on all 16 areas.

- Not a real experience without a structured system.

- It is important for the intern to understand the full service architecture firm. How would an architect understand the type of delivery approach or how to bill (fixed vs. hourly) if that architect has limited experience in a full service firm.

- It seems that a person could, from how I interpret this question, work as solely a designer within Schematic Design and receive units for the other 15 areas?

- In that case, one may only gain experience in a few areas. This is happening a lot in construction document drawing (the task interns are hired for). In my office, the bosses don't trust interns to do most of the other areas, especially client meetings, pre-design, etc. So, I'm unable to complete IDP here.

- The office of employment and the supervising architect must assign the tasks to the employee only if the office is small enough for the employee to benefit out of this. In a large office, this is impossible without any organized tasks.

- I think that would be the other extreme.

- My IDP experience was, for the most part, a good one. I believe that it allows interns, who most likely will excel in a given area, to see all aspects of the profession, thereby better preparing them for licensure.

None

- This is a tough one. If no, I'm afraid all 700 units would be in construction documents. The one useful part of IDP is that you get to talk to your supervisor about switching projects/gaining more responsibility to satisfy IDP requirements. Or switch jobs frequently to gain more experience.
- I'm not sure I understand the question.
- I don't know – it hasn't affected me. I think we should be like everyone else and adopt the national standard and stop screwing around.

Duration Requirement

Under IDP conditions, interns must be employed at least 35 hours per week for a minimum period of 10 consecutive weeks or at least 20 hours per week for a minimum period of six (6) consecutive months. This is the "duration requirement."

21. Was this requirement or would this requirement have been a hindrance to completing your internship?   **Y** 35 (28%)   **N** 88 (72%)

COMMENTS

Yes

- Although time could not be counted as it did not meet minimum employment requirements.
- I "lost" about 80 credits because of this.
- Makes it hard to count summer jobs.

No

- Just takes longer.

22. In your opinion, the duration requirement (check only one)

Is acceptable as is.	69 (56%)
Should be eliminated.	19 (15%)
Should be amended.	17 (14%)
At least 20 hours per week for a minimum period of 10 consecutive weeks.	13 (11%)
Other, please specify	4 (3%)
Comments	

COMMENTS

Is Acceptable as Is.

- Possibly the only part that makes sense. It takes a while to be an active and involved participant within an office – Isn't this similar to the state requirements?
- If you are honest about your training units, it will likely take longer than the duration requirement to fulfill all the TU's.
- It is important to understand what work is being completed within the project and to see how that project fits within the management of the firm.
- I agree that consistent, consecutive employment exposes interns to the appropriate breadth of necessary skills and training.

- The structure of the content is clear and to the point and steps you through the training requirements thoroughly.
- The ten-week option is not enough time.

Should be Eliminated.

- Minimum should be completely eliminated as they restrict experience gained while attending college.
- It is time to redefine "business hours." People want to pursue other personal interests, in addition to their professional goals and should not be required to operate under this imposing requirement. Things and people season over time.
- Interns can gain experience and learn in ways that do not produce a paycheck.

Should be Amended

- To suit each individual's desired career path!
- Sometimes 10 weeks during the summer while in school is difficult.
- Encourage and accommodate working students.
- In my situation, I worked for an architect doing code research that equated to about 7 units but was not credited to my completion units because I worked 35 hours a week for 9 weeks. It might have been nice to have something set up in the program which sees special cases if the licensed architect is willing to help provide evidence of the experience gained by the intern.
- What about those who work 10-15 hours/week through the school year?

At Least 20 Hours for 10 Weeks

- I have worked in a "consultant" capacity for a project for 4 months. I believe even if it was part-time for a shorter period, the experience should count.
- Those who are attending school and working part-time should receive credit if the duration of employment is at least the length of the term (semester or two quarters).
- I am a new mother and unable to work full-time. There may be other "uncommon" conditions not taken into account. I've been back at work for 4 months after my (4 month) maternity leave and want to quit now. In current case, I would not qualify for any training units for this period of 4 months, since I only work 30 hours per week. I've been with the firm for 2-1/2 years total. I'm very much up to speed with the office.

Other / None

- Part-time work as an intern (summer, holiday) is as valid as anything else.
- If an intern works at least 10 consecutive weeks for a firm at any time (for example, a summer), they should be allowed to work less than 10 weeks at another time (for example, Christmas) and be allowed to count it. This requirement is good in that it keeps incompetent interns from "firm hopping." But it keeps students from counting legitimate work done on holidays.
- I'm still not sure if the duration requirement is 35 hours/week for 10 consecutive weeks is the time or the 700 total units.
- 10 hours/week

Overall Comments Regarding IDP

Comments _____

COMMENTS

- IDP is an excellent idea and should be adopted. Unfortunately it is easy for someone coming out of school to get "pigeon holed" by their employer making it difficult to complete some of the IDP requirements. In a good economy, "speaking up" works but I'm not sure it would work in a bad economy.

- Suggest adding incentives for the employers to become more actively participating in the intern development.
  Educate employers about IDP (not only interns).

- General idea is good, but:
  - Too expensive.
  - Too much paperwork & "pickyness" regarding <u>strictness</u> <u>of</u> <u>categories.</u>
  - Need employer education.

- Architecture should be a joy!!
  Should be <u>restructured</u> to be less of a <u>barrier</u>! It is expensive, frustrating and time consuming. As it is many interns are exploited by firms who demand (tacitly or otherwise) disproportionate amount of working hours (not to mention ridiculously low compensation). After a 60+ work week (<u>not</u> uncommon), the young, creative mind needs some <u>rest</u>, not additional complicated, mandated, restrictive policy and paperwork!!

- NCARB is now doing the same thing CAB has done for me for nearly 6 years – keeping track of my experience records. NCARB costs are about 5-6 times higher and continue to increase. I believe the main reason less candidates are taking the ARE is because more states are making IDP mandatory. It is an overly complicated and costly way of regulating architects. California and CAB are doing a <u>great</u> job at keeping their candidates informed. I thought getting through school was tough. Please don't sell us out to bad bureaucracy!

- IDP is geared towards working in a <u>very</u> traditional architectural office. There are no considerations for remodel/renovation work/firms. Working in this sort of firm makes site (and programming) "points" harder to obtain. The mentor is a very important part of IDP and should be maintained. I strongly think that we should be able to start ARE before finishing IDP. Questions 16-20 are very difficult to understand.

- The IDP program is badly biased to candidates who are engaged in traditional practice. I received my B.Arch. from the University of Tennessee in 1997 and have worked exclusively in Construction Management since graduation. I was fortunate to have worked for a firm for nearly two years that was engaged in a great deal of design/build work which allowed me to work for an architect on our staff and begin gaining credit towards my licensing requirement. The State of California gladly accepted this experience towards my licensing requirement; IDP continually threw up barriers to counting it. A large General Contractor currently employs me in Pre-Construction Services, working with design/build and design assist projects while they are still in the conceptual design stages. I am regularly involved in shaping the design of projects through interaction with the owner and the design team. Friends of mine who are in traditional practice regularly complain that I get much better exposure to every area of IDP training (except Contract Document preparation) than they get in their firms. In fact, most of these people have to beg their employers to let them gain experience in many of the IDP areas that I do every day. IDP has also been shown to be so uncompromisingly rigid that candidates freely admit to cheating on their requirements in order to complete them and become eligible to sit for the ARE (Architecture Record, Sept 1999). For these reasons, I feel that California should look long and hard at IDP before adopting it.

- California being involved with NCARB needs to be approached carefully, with test attendance down and test prices up, I believe NCARB is in for rough times.

- Although California at the moment does not require IDP, I believe that it is to the advantage of each candidate to participate as it helped me in the ARE. California should <u>definitely</u> adopt and require candidates to participate in IDP before taking the ARE.

- My experience with IDP was somewhat frustrating. I worked very hard to get it when I lived in another state; and then when I moved to California, no one had to do it! It should be more consistent on a national level. I must admit that the whole IDP thing, however, just seems like another way for NCARB to financially gauge young people who don't make enough money to begin with!

- It's great to hear CAB is taking this step.

- It is unrealistic to believe that an intern can obtain experiences covering all 16 training areas in one single workplace. This <u>forces</u> an intern to changes jobs in order to complete the IDP requirements – that isn't necessarily correct. It strives against your personal choice to where you (intern) want to work!

- Personally, **I like having both options in California** where I can take the oral exams with 3 years of (any) experience under a registered architect without having to complete IDP first. Then I can take my time completing IDP, use it as a bargaining chip at work to get a broad range of experiences, and still have reciprocity (eventually) in other states once IDP is completed. As a result, I am the queen of paperwork, since I have both CBAE and NCARB forms to fill out.

- Too expensive!

- Not easy to fill certain training areas but it's good because it shows employers that we need to be well rounded. Cost is too high when it is on top of ARE and associated costs for classes, exams, etc. In general though, IDP is a good thing.

- Nearly every IDP participant I know has had to "fudge" their units in order to complete IDP. If everyone is lying about it, what purpose does it serve? (Other than funding NCARB.)

- Why are IDP fees so expensive?
  Candidates, I believe, know the experience they need to be a well-rounded architect. If not, the state board should outline the types of experiences an intern should receive. The ARE is the leveler across the country that decides who is qualified to be licensed. A candidate should be able to sit for the ARE after doing 3 years in an office after a B.Arch or equivalent.

- There is a huge lack of awareness by the entire architecture community of IDP and what it is. I never received any assistance by a firm to help me obtain units in training areas. In fact, I had to explain what the program was to each supervisor whom I needed to sign the forms.

- IDP is a weak attempt at internship, like it or not, anyone can "practice" architecture. You can't stamp drawings or call yourself "architect," but you can practice architecture – look at Maya Lin and Tadao Ando. Until the profession of architecture has a true internship like the medical profession, pre-registered practitioners of architecture will continue to practice architecture. There is no internship and there will not be until the profession requires registration prior to doing what I've been doing for 8 years – "architecture under supervision." The profession will never pay for a true internship when it doesn't have to.

- Allow interns maximum flexibility in IDP to prevent creating an unreasonable obstacle to licensure. An additional consideration should be the intern's ability to shape their internship to focus on personal interests and future expertise.

- I have worked in 2 offices since leaving school. Neither office was interested in nor encouraged the IDP program. I could have falsified the reports and superiors probably would have signed them. I could not, in good conscience, do that. I suspect a great number of interns are in the same position as I. I also suspect that most reports do not accurately reflect what is really happening. Therefore, I believe the IDP program is flawed. To base registration on it is extremely misguided.

- I enrolled in IDP during my undergraduate degree as it was a requirement in the state I went to school in. At the time, I found it to be a huge, unnecessary expense. During my first internship in Chicago, I began keeping track of my value units in the required areas and realized that it was a time-consuming and trivial thing to do. The required training areas, many of which are rarely encountered by an intern, encourage dishonesty in reporting. Architectural graduates should be trusted to control their own experience in preparing for the ARE. I don't feel that California architects have suffered or are lacking in any expertise – adoption of the IDP would increase only barriers and costs, not quality of training.

- I completed IDP and find it as a good basis for training/apprenticeship after school, but it requires a much more rigid framework of accountability by the employer rather than placing all record keeping with the employee/intern.

- For me, I wanted to make sure I had a diverse background in all areas of architecture. IDP helps me acquire this background. There are problems with IDP that I think should not be "required" by everyone in the state. The biggest problem is the training setting limit. I am enjoying my IDP training, but this is not for everyone.

- I think that IDP should be adopted. Both firms and employees benefit. "Intern" is a mis-used term and often is confused with temporary student help. This is a service to young architects as they may want to practice in other states – later. California architects sometimes have a bad reputation as being poorly trained – this could help this perception.

- I have found IDP nothing more than a record keeping organization that charges <u>extremely</u> unreasonable fees. I believe it to be <u>useless</u>. Architects should take control of their careers. The licensing exam is a tool to test the knowledge of an architect. Why do we need IDP? We do not need our hands held!

- I think doing the IDP internship was very useful to me. It's a way of making sure an intern gets exposed to all sides of architectural practice. I think California should adopt it.

- Many of the IDP hours are hard to get, and it is not reasonable to ask to be changed to a job that would fill these hours. Employers don't think about IDP or giving interns a "round" education. Until it is mandatory for offices to help their interns through this process, it will be difficult to follow their rules. Also supplementary education hours are impossible to get and they need to be looked into.

- Having worked in states that do require IDP – the one benefit I have noticed is that senior architects take a more active role in mentoring interns. This is one of the best ways to learn and grow. My experience in California is that, while I am fortunate to have several years experience, the fresh intern just out of school is ignored and treated very poorly. As for preparation for the ARE, IDP is not a guarantee of success, or there would be no registered architects in California. I have mixed feelings about the whole experience. My experience with IDP has been that they cash my checks very efficiently, but really provide no support for interns. Overall, I have been disappointed with the experience.

- The greatest hindrance to adopting IDP in this state would be that those candidates not holding a professional degree could not become licensed. As a Bachelor of Science with 5 years experience in the field, I feel that the decision whether one practices architecture should not hinder on the degree he holds, but rather on his performance abilities and knowledge of the practice.

- IDP is a good idea in theory. In practice, architects are more concerned about deadlines and profit. Fulfilling categories can be problematic. Architects who care about professional development will see to it that interns receive appropriate experience. Those that don't will exploit the cheap intern labor pool. I'm not convinced IDP makes a difference.

- As an intern enrolled in IDP and CAB, I can say that in principle the idea of IDP is good. However, it is difficult to complete the total required time for all IDP units. For example, in California I am now eligible for the oral exam and licensure. IDP still requires many "time units" that I have not been able to complete. I think practicing architects not used to the additional paperwork/expense of IDP will resist it. Further, IDP is often seen as a bother – will mentors just sign off on time reports without review? Good mentoring will not be imposed simply by initiating IDP. It would be nice if you could leave things the way they are and still make NCARB happy.

- I strongly believe in the IDP and think that it should be adopted by the state as soon as possible.

- When completed properly, <u>honestly</u>, IDP is a definite plus. It, however, adds an increased cost to becoming an architect.

- It's difficult to keep an accurate record of training because some employees are supervised under several architects in a firm when working on several projects at one time.

- How would these program requirements differ from the current requirements of NCARB? Would this IDP cover everything for the individual to qualify? Please enlighten me on this issue.

- I believe it is widely accepted by interns, but misunderstood by most professionals. While most firms I interviewed with said that they would participate, they did not have the necessary information to make it as valuable an experience as it could be. Most California firms will continue to give IDP lip service until it is required. Completion of IDP should not be a condition for commencement of the ARE. They should be concurrent.

- I have encountered a variety of opinions on the value of IDP among my various employers. Some take it very seriously, accounting for every hour; others treat it as a guideline and don't care about actual recorded hours. One former employer admitted that he essentially cheated on his own IDP training. Maybe IDP needs to educate employers on the merits of the program.

- Please encourage architecture students to participate in IDP and tell them the benefits of the program, especially easier reciprocal licensing with other states/countries. Please encourage AIA members to help their interns complete IDP.

- 44 states can't be wrong. Why is California not leading the way?

- IDP should make a list of companies who are willing to benefit interns' knowledge and expose interns to all aspects of architecture. It is very unfair that companies often do not care for interns and only want to slave them because they are aware of the IDP, and interns have no choice but only to accept. It is an unhealthy environment that CAB and NCARB have put interns there and offer no help to them.

- IDP cripples candidates. I have been working full-time for five years, and I still haven't finished my IDP requirements. That doesn't mean I am not qualified to take the exam. Tabulating hours and running around after people for signatures was never a priority and for that reason most people "fake" their IDP credits. It is absolutely impossible to finish IDP requirements in two or three years – or even five.

- Great program to train a well-rounded architect. However, it is necessary to add training requirements specifically for California.

- If IDP is adopted, let IDP be another alternative as proof of competency and experience. Requirements do not necessarily have IDP replace a system which has worked well for the state. If IDP is adopted, current candidates in the exam process should be grandfathered and exempt from IDP requirements.

- Good program – forces employer to provide the necessary experience.

- My personal experience with IDP has been great. I am receiving a well-rounded internship and I have found it to be a great leverage tool. Maybe the California ARE scores would not be so low if we finally made IDP a requirement!

- IDP program is beneficial to interns and employers. It allows interns an "excuse" to be exposed to all training areas and allows employers to tap into unrealized resources. California interns need to be marketable in other markets. The cost of IDP is less than trying to gain reciprocity without it.

- Although I believe a structured internship as a learning tool is best for the intern, the firm, and the profession, using a checklist may not be the best format. Interns may be more interested in "checking off" a requirement than understanding what they are doing. Also, CAB may already know this, but in reality the supervising architect doesn't seem too interested in the accountability of the intern. Most interns I have known and know have been less than truthful about fulfilling the requirements.

- I believe that the IDP is a necessary step to the initiation of a new architect, but one that is difficult to administer fairly and equitably. The IDP fails when it acts as a barrier to architects being qualified, because of some administrative requirement that may not take cognizance of reality within the profession of architecture or variance regarding the status of the economy. Further, the IDP can only be beneficial if the architects administering an intern's progress take it seriously.

- Interns are already slave labor in the majority of firms. Requiring IDP will worsen that situation. The cost of completing IDP should be free or minimal to interns. Pay is extremely low and benefits nearly non-existent for interns, who are paying exorbitant fees to take the ARE.

- Overall, I feel that IDP is a good idea, for it seem to express a well-structured program, leading to more competent architects in the future. I do feel, however, that completing the IDP program will be somewhat difficult for interns. It seems unrealistic to plan when you will get experience in certain training areas, and then how much, by the fact of California architectural firms being so varied in their services and their techniques for providing those services – meaning from firms that seem to be mainly interested in making money quickly, to firms that are interested in providing quality for the environment. IDP candidates would probably receive better and varied training in a smaller firm than in a larger one where it seem people stay within the same tasks for longer periods of time.

- The NCARB Intern Development Program was intended to provide interns a well-rounded on-the-job training experience to prevent "pigeon holing" and prepare individuals for professional practice – not to prepare them to pass the ARE or NCARB exams. Well intended, IDP falls short of the intended objectives. Interns find themselves forced to fill mandated credit requirements regardless of their strengths and weaknesses. Employers and employees/interns often know better where emphasis is needed and can better plan a learning/on-the-job training process to fit the individual versus a one-size-fits-all list of training units.

- I encourage CAB to simply require IDP completion through NCARB. Adoption of IDP with California specific provisions that lessen the quantity or quality of units credited to an intern, as the survey questions suggest, dilutes the effectiveness of the program.
  It is the strict work setting requirements that provide a balance of architectural phases and project roles needed for an intern to develop into a highly competent architect. I found NCARB's IDP very helpful in providing a structure to discuss and plan future project responsibilities with my employer. Without IDP, I would have been less able to get the well-rounded experience I desired.
  Ideally, California's requirement for IDP completion will lead to an increased importance of experience over test-taking ability, and eventually will lead to revocation of the inaccuracies and irrelevance of the current ARE.

- The whole profession needs to participate for it to have value. I think this will be the hardest but most important hurdle that California IDP will face.

- The talk in school was that NCARB would unify the practice on a national level. It seems to have only created additional paperwork. California has the most stringent testing, maybe that should be the standard.
  IDP is a waste of my money and now I am stuck!

- IDP is a well-intended program. But it is not a fix-all solution to become a well-rounded and well-trained architect. IDP is a hinder to take your ARE when you are ready. The requirement of about 3 years of working hours before taking the exams is not time efficient. And also, the cost of IDP is too high.
  I understand and enroll in IDP because I lived in Illinois. However, I am pleased to be able to start taking my ARE as soon as I moved to California.

- Certain training areas are almost impossible to achieve in a working office. The independent study areas used to fulfill the above are a complete joke.

- The conversion of hours to "value units" and the record keeping involved in IDP are very tedious. I think IDP would be more successful if it was more user-friendly. There is a lot of (unnecessary) paperwork involved.

- I found no problem satisfying the IDP requirements. It gives some focus to the "internship" prior to licensure.

- The Training Setting Requirements were changed during my internship, and the job I accepted did not qualify under the new rules. I feel that the original rules should be "grandfathered" in to cover existing internships started under the original rules, i.e., new rules cover people starting new internships.

- Good idea! But not working in California, even for those who have chosen to participate. Employers don't want to do anything extra – spend time or money for interns with IDP. The faster and better you can draft or do projects from beginning to end, the better.

- In my current firm, in Oregon, people have been practicing for 5 years and still not licensed or IDP qualified. In California, people could be licensed in 1 or 2 years out of school. This process is a hindrance to our profession. I resent being called an "intern" just because I am not licensed. I only went through the process because I knew I would move from California eventually. It's just another way to get more money. I didn't <u>learn</u> anything from the process! My supervisor just signed off to get it out of the way. HA!

- Less paperwork and less time required, especially from employer.

- The training keeps you thinking about issues that will come up in your daily work days and will give each student experience to deal with different situations.

- I wish IDP would offer more ways to gain the required work experience, such as through the use of the supplemental education guide. Also, I wish IDP would relate/incorporate the Architect's Handbook of Professional Practice more into their program. If IDP is truly an intern development program, then is should do just that – develop interns! How do you accomplish this? By information, education, and communication – training, too. Not just by more documentation. Some may rather call it the Intern <u>Documentation</u> Program. Overall, my experience with IDP was good. I'm glad I'm finished with it. But by no means do I feel my learning has stopped. It has only begun. I hope IDP can expand its "curriculum" and truly become a solid program that develops interns into architects. After all, the span from education/college to actual practice is so vast. IDP is now the only bridge spanning that gap. So, it is <u>vital</u> to all of us.

- I feel IDP is a waste of time, money, and paper. Most firms cannot provide 16 training areas to candidates, maybe 3 or 4 tops. Be realistic. If IDP must happen, all candidates in the exam process should be grandfathered in. Thanks in advance for this survey.

- My main issue with IDP is NCARB's inaccessibility and seemingly disorganized structure. I (must) pay a substantial amount of money to maintain my IDP record and have received very poor customer service in terms of getting information from my file. Where does all that money go? Certainly not to serving the people who pay it.

- If the 700 units is the requirement, this means a candidate must go though a 2 year and 8 month training/experience period to satisfy IDP units. This is good only if the exam is not in between the program. Or licensing is not held back because of the 700 units. Please be clear on the two issues – 700 units or 35 hours/week?

- In many firms, completing the continuing education portion of IDP is difficult because firms will not pay for educational opportunities outside of the office. Also, many firms do not acknowledge IDP, making it difficult to fulfill IDP credits in such a work setting. Also, NCARB is a poorly run organization, adding to the aggravation.

- I personally have had no problems but do know people that have had to leave firms to fulfill requirements within IDP. It appears that a person in a large firm that may get pigeon-holed has trouble fulfilling the sixteen areas. I have worked for a 20-person firm and a 70+-person firm, so I have been able to fulfill all the different areas. The hardest section I am finding is the community service.

- It should be clarified while in school – along with the entire accreditation process. I was confused. My students are confused. It is horrendously complicated if seen as one activity.

- I think that more structure is not necessarily bad, but it has to take into account the vicissitudes of the profession. I have a friend who worked for seven firms in the first year out of school because it was 1991 and it was a recession. Should she get punished by the profession because she is getting punished by the economy?
Perhaps the architecture schools should have responsibility for providing a structured experience to their alumni.

- What is wrong with the current system and requirements?

- As much as I would not like to pay for participation in IDP, it seems to be a well thought out and organized process. Therefore, I would advocate participation.

- I know many qualified interns that are very intimidated by IDP because of the requirements. I believe the current system needs serious modifications to encourage more participation. I am also shocked at the prices of the exam. Also, please make it more affordable!

- Overall, I believe the goal of the IDP program is sound. It provides a framework to maximize a broad area of work experience. However, I do not agree with the concept of having to complete IDP prior to taking the exam. I believe that both can and should be allowed to happen together as a total and complimentary system.

- Architects do not need another hoop to jump through on the licensing process. I appreciate the effort to improve the quality of interns' experience, but architecture is very much a learned profession and even requiring 700 training units does not guarantee a well-rounded experience, nor will it necessarily produce better architects. It has more to do with the type of person one is. I believe it is better to let people get out there and prove what they can do, for better or for worse.

- To "sit" for the ARE – the requirement is low. A candidate cannot amass the information and knowledge needed to pass the exams under the existing timeframe. You need the field experience – not school experience – to be an effective architect.

- Yes, do it! Get with it!!

- The requirement of a degree from a NAAB-accredited program must be eliminated. There are many schools and areas of learning that provide much more and far better teaching and experience than most accredited schools. IDP is an unnecessary expense in both time and money and does not help the intern in any way. IDP will close the door of opportunity to many aspiring and potentially great architects.

- California should make this program mandatory. Architects/interns are well rounded versus "book smart" people that pass the exam.

Candidate Profile

1. **Please describe your current internship status.**

I have completed IDP.	n/a
I am participating in IDP.	n/a
I have completed (non-IDP) experience for California licensure.	332 (68%)
I am earning credit for (non-IDP) experience for California licensure.	159 (32%)
None of the above.	n/a
Please explain _____	

COMMENTS

- Also, I have previously participated in IDP but let my account lapse. Too cumbersome a process.

- Working full-time with architect – have 5 years.

- I'm assuming if I have already achieved total hours that I do not need more!

- 11 years practice as an architect outside USA. 2 years practice in USA.

- Have accumulated 8 years minimum experience for California architect standards.

- I finished university outside USA. Currently working in a US architectural company.

- I worked several years under different architects and have from A to Z and started other ones.

- I have been in this profession 40 years and have been involved in all aspects as noted. I believe all participants should have the minimum hours as recommended.

- I have 8 years working experience in architecture firms under licensed architects.

- I work in a construction defect forensic office, under direct supervision of a licensed architect and licensed general contractor.

- I am a foreign graduate with more than 15 years of international experience, licensed with other countries overseas.

- I am lacking 2 months of non-IDP.

- I initially signed up for the IDP but withdrew once I learned of all the requirements and discovered it wasn't truly necessary for licensure.

- I enrolled in IDP from '91-93. For the difficulty of finding advisors, I dropped off.

- As it is not required for California, I have not pursued it. I should investigate reciprocity issues. If not necessary, I cannot imagine doing it because of the ridiculously exorbitant cost.

- I have met the 8-years of education/experience as required.

- I am currently taking exams and have satisfied all prior requirements.

- I have a 4-year degree and 13 years experience under a licensed professional.

- Not required in State of California.

- I asked my employer if he would be interested in the IDP program. He said he did not want to take the time. Perhaps if there was a kick-back in dues or some type of credit or benefit to an employer as he, he might have considered it.

- Was not aware this program was available in California.

- I started working for a small firm in 1988 where they discouraged the new grads to do IDP. They did not wish to take the time or money to do so. We were on our own.
- Already completed equivalent in order to sit for examination.
- I am not participating in IDP (although I have completed all requirements) – do not have the money.
- I do not have an architecture degree; and, therefore, I'm barred from the program.
- Not enacted in California.
- Started ARE process 12 years ago. No IDP was encouraged.
- I started IDP but gave it up.
- I haven't participated in IDP since it hasn't been required in California.

2. What is your examination status?

I have completed the ARE (Architect Registration Examination).	25 (5%)
I am in the process of taking the ARE.	401 (82%)
I have not yet begun the ARE.*	63 (13%)
I do not plan to take the ARE.*	0 (0%)

* Please explain why _____

3. Do you plan to practice outside California? **Y** 284 (58%) **N** 167 (34%)
- ▸ **In other states?** **Y** 283 (58%) **N** 116 (24%)
- ▸ **Internationally?** **Y** 173 (35%) **N** 187 (38%)

4. Have you had any difficulty contacting
- ▸ **CAB?** **Y** 27 (5%) **N** 419 (85%)
- ▸ **NCARB?** **Y** 55 (11%) **N** 388 (79%)

If Yes, please explain _____

COMMENTS

CAB
- Sent in new "Change of Address" form and requested to have June 1996 exam results sent to me. Have never received results. Tried calling your automated phone system with no results.
- Last time I called, I had difficulty speaking to a live person who would be helpful. I had to leave messages on voice mail to receive information via mail.
- The lengthy electronic greeting prompt service takes too long to actually speak to a live person about specific details. Also some attendants are rude and quick to get you off the line when you still have questions.
- First I've heard of CAB.
- Left messages, not returned.
- Long distance, hard to get study guide.

NCARB
- The phone operators at NCARB have no understanding of their Byzantine, Brazil-like organization, and each department seems to have no idea what the other departments do.
- Getting through to the appropriate person via telephone.

- Frequently, during the examination process (ARE), I encountered obstinate and unhelpful employees. During one exam session (after the computer program failed), I had difficulty reaching anyone who could assist me. Quite frankly, many of the NCARB staff are rude! (Or at least untrained.)

- Hours are East Coast time. I had trouble this past year with eligibility for testing, CAB helped me but NCARB could not get it straight or solve the problem.

- I could never get in touch with a real person at NCARB to discuss application filings or fees – only a generic recording (this was about 2 years ago).

- An issue with my submitted forms was at issue and I attempted to contact them about the matter. It took two weeks for a return call.

- I needed to contact NCARB regarding my Authorization to Test after you approved my application; and when I called the CAB, the person I spoke to was rude and could only give me their (NCARB's) direct phone number. I wanted an 800 number. So I sent two e-mails that were unanswered.

- It usually takes a long time to get an answer, or sometimes no response after leaving voice mail.

- As I mentioned above, NCARB has been of no help in getting the practice software to operate.

- When trying to get my status, I was shuffled to various programs. All I wanted was my NCARB number and status – it took 4 phone calls.

- Easy to reach, but they don't like to talk/answer anything beyond a basic question.

- Always on hold.

- They take too much time to process information.

- Long wait by phone.

- Still uncertain about requirements for license in other states once licensed in California.

- I have been trying to schedule "practice exams" with Sylvan. Their computers do not allow any scheduling after December 31, 1999. I have called NCARB and left messages. I have had no response. I am very disappointed – especially since I am taking a test on January 12, 2000!

- It appears there is a lack of personnel to answer the phone and when they do, they put you on hold! (Long distance – gets old.)

- They don't answer phones. Not helpful when they do.

- Information and process for scheduling test have been frustrating.

- They don't always return phone calls.

- I was disconnected by NCARB phone system before talking to anyone or leaving a message.

- For scheduling and exam help.

- "Computer problem" which I had with test results regardless of leaving messages at NCARB is still not solved. I do not get "areas of weakness" with each test.

- What is CAB? Difficult to find information on web.

- I have always gotten through on the phone but the bureaucratic red tape that is involved is ridiculous. I worry that adopting (IDP) will only increase this problem while costing the interns money they don't have.

- Always get voice mail. When calls are returned, they rarely have competent answers. You get the run around.

- Long…wait times to talk to someone and/or unable to get through at all. Also, NCARB has consistently lost my personal information, including my SS# and credit card information.

- Long phone fees and people passing you to other people.

- Keep changing phone number or policy.

- Each call I make to NCARB leads to few answers. Since NCARB's restructuring, my files and records have been lost and mixed up.

- I failed an exam and waited to find out test results, and NCARB was very difficult to contact to discuss the problem.
- Hard to reach them – always need to make lots of phone calls or wait for a couple of days for them to return the call.
- Not always available, message not always returned.

Both

- It would be nice to have a toll-free 1-800 number to ask general questions regarding licensing, reciprocity, etc. It is difficult to simply talk to someone who could answer my questions.
- Answering system, leaving message, and never get back. Lines are busy most of the time.
- Standard 8-week response is too long!!
- I began taking my exams in Arizona and also changed my name. Transferring them to California was difficult.
- Difficult to get them on the phone, difficult to get definitive answers, difficult to appeal. Rules regarding credit for work experience not clear, though the answer is always no.
- I have bounced around to find NCARB.
- Automated system is horrible! It's very difficult to get a real person. Also was disconnected several times.
- The number for the public only gives a long (very annoying) answering recording. I found it extremely difficult to find answers by calling these numbers.
- It'd be helpful if there were some non-9 to 5 M-F hours to call and get information.
- Usually getting machine – messages; no "real person" to talk to; no returning phone calls.
- There are confusions between NCARB and ARE and CAB about the responsibilities each has.
- When they lost my payment for testing it took almost 6 months to get in touch with them regarding my test results.
- Long waits on the phone.
- CAB & NCARB cannot respond to e-mail/fax as efficiently! Since I work in Hong Kong with a time zone of 13 to 16 hours difference.

Your Current Job

5. How long have you worked for your current firm?   average   3 y 2 m

6. On average, how many hours per week do you work?   average   44 hrs

7. Do you work under the direct supervision of a licensed architect?   Y 423 (86%)   N 66 (13%)

8. Please describe your current employment status with your firm.

I am a full-time, permanent employee.	424 (86%)
I am a part-time, permanent employee.	7 (1%)
I am a temporary employee.	1 (0%)
I am an intermittent employee.	1 (0%)
I am a contracted consultant or other contracted position.	25 (5%)

I am the employer.			15 (3%)
I am in partnership with an architect.			8 (2%)
None of the above.			
Please explain			

9. **Does your firm's practice cover all of the 16 areas in the IDP Training Requirement?**   **Y** 328 (67%)   **N** 133 (27%)

10. **Does your firm participate in IDP?**   **Y** 61 (12%)   **N** 397 (81%)

If no, do you think your firm/supervisor would actively participate in IDP? (Please check only one.)

If an intern asked them to	126 (26%)
Only if it were mandatory	122 (25%)
Do not know	145 (30%)

Your Exposure to/Opinion About IDP

11. **Had you previously heard of IDP?**   **Y** 446 (91%)   **N** 43 (9%)

12. **Where did you learn about IDP?**

In school	210 (43%)
From a friend	68 (14%)
From a supervisor/firm	36 (7%)
From a professional association	109 (22%)
From the California Architects Board	140 (29%)
Other	23 (5%)

COMMENTS

- AIAS
- From requirements in another state.
- AIA
- Architectural Magazine
- From NCARB.
- NCARB
- I first learned from my current employer upon moving to Oregon.
- Salt Lake City, Utah Chapter AIA
- Participated in IDP when working in Connecticut 1988 and 1989.
- NCARB
- Directly from the two University of Texas students on whose thesis project the original IDP program study was based.
- AIA

- While in Maryland (working).
- Sounds like another layer of bureaucracy to generate more money.
- Professional literature.
- You just sent this information to me.
- Other states.
- Thought about moving to Texas.
- I have participated in IDP in another state.
- Various sources.
- I didn't.
- Unknown!
- Worked in state that had IDP.
- AIAS
- When I received this letter.
- Read about it in magazine.
- Office conversation.

13. Are you familiar with the 16 training areas contained in the IDP Training Requirement?   **Y** 363 (74%)   **N** 120 (24%)

14. Based on your knowledge of IDP, do you think IDP would (check as many as you think apply)

Create an unreasonable barrier to getting your architect license.	322 (66%)
Unreasonably increase costs to you (see attached fee information).	393 (80%)
Unreasonably increase costs to your firm/supervisor.	251 (51%)

COMMENTS

Barrier to Getting Your Architect License

- If I can't be grandfathered in!
- But not if I had started IDP in school 20 years ago.
- No, I have gotten most of the experience mentioned – it just hasn't been documented specifically.
- Maybe.
- In its present form.
- More paperwork, time, and money.
- It would be an extra pain in the a**.

Increase Costs to You

- In its present form.
- Costs are already too high, based on our professional income.
- The process of obtaining a license and maintaining it is already expensive!
- This is the most important reason!
- More paperwork, time, and money.
- It's ridiculous!!!

- H*** yes – what the h*** do you do with all the money?
- It would be an extra pain in the a**.

Increase Costs to Your Firm

- In its present form.
- Costs are already too high, based on our professional income.
- The process of obtaining a license and maintaining it is already expensive!
- It would be an extra pain in the a**.

None

- I don't know.

15. **Compared to less structured internships, do you think IDP <u>better</u> prepares candidates (check as many as you think apply)**

To take and pass the ARE.	97 (20%)
To take and pass the California Supplemental Examination.	54 (11%)
To become a more competent, well-rounded architect.	197 (40%)
To become more marketable to a firm/employer.	108 (22%)
To practice in other states and countries.	137 (28%)
Other	12 (2%)

<u>COMMENTS</u>

To Take and Pass the ARE

- Probably.
- Probably.

To Become a More Competent, Well-Rounded Architect

- If all of these areas were not covered under a non-IDP internship.
- In theory.

To Become More Marketable to Firm

- Quite the opposite.
- IDP could make candidates to be cheap labor for big firms.

To Practice in Other States

- Possibly, only due to lock-step adoption in other states.
- Maybe.
- IDP could make candidates to be cheap labor for big firms.
- IDP should allow for apprentice architects (8 years in architecture office).
- I'm not sure how well it does. How about some statistics?
- Only because other states require IDP.

Other / None

- No opinion.
- Don't know the impact this will have.

- Have no idea.
- None apply because if you work in for example Los Angeles gaining knowledge there won't help in New York.
- Not help or make any difference any way.
- How can this be judged? A majority of architects today do the above without going through a structured internship, correct?
- I have not participated in the IDP program, so I cannot attest to any of the statements. I feel I have received the experience required by the IDP on my own.
- None of the above.
- If you can pass the exam, you know what you need to practice.
- None of the above.
- Don't know.
- Not sure.
- I don't think IDP helps to better anything.
- None of the above. What is the difference with IDP and NCARB internship?
- Competence, well roundedness, and employability come with an individual's experience and self-motivation as well as making individual choices in life.
- IDP would not be better than less structured internship.
- Can't comment – our firm has not participated in the 20 years of its existence, and I've been with them 15-1/2 years.
- Force employers to actively train interns. Costly to employers.
- None of the above.
- No, I think it just adds cost and paperwork time to the already very busy schedule of an intern architect. Any responsible intern architect works to get a variety of experience so that he/she can be a well-rounded architect – with or without this requirement.
- To practice things other than architecture.
- This question is not neutral to the survey. It implies that other forms (of currently acceptable training to take the ARE) of work experience produce less competent architects!!
- It's probably more goal oriented than regular internship, therefore faster experience gain.
- Self-motivation makes for a better architect. All these requirements are exhausting!
- The standards IDP sets for interns should be a professional practice of training by architects established by AIA at no cost to interns – simply professional practice.
- Prepares candidates in a shorter amount of time for the practice of architecture since most employees don't get a diverse amount of experience, i.e., sit in front of computers far too much.
- I do not think it betters a candidate. Candidates will do better with long term, consistent experience in many areas of practice.
- It depends on the individual initiative and attitude.
- None of the above!
- I don't know of other structured internships.
- Employers use interns as cheap labor in the office.
- To fill out useless paperwork.
- I don't think IDP helps in any respect.
- Not necessarily any of the above.
- Creates another layer of cost and bureaucracy.

- None of the above.
- None of the above/tests change too often.
- Don't know.
- I don't know.
- No – it is just a way for some outside group to make money at expense of those who can ill afford it.
- IDP <u>might</u> better prepare a candidate to become licensed.
- None.
- Don't know.
- I've heard mixed reactions, thus can't honestly answer.
- None of the above.
- It depends. Sometimes you can get a well-rounded job experience with the right, conscientious employer.
- All of the above if they are not in an office that allows them to participate in these areas already.
- Not familiar with other internship programs.
- Waste a lot of time and money.
- It does none – <u>none</u> of the above.
- Over time, most positions require some exposure to all the IDP divisions.
- I really don't know other internships.
- To become less self-reliant.
- No, IDP seems too "time-based", not competency-based.
- To pay additional, useless fees!!
- To further hinder their focus on real architecture.
- I believe the IDP is an income generating program that creates unnecessary paperwork for all parties involved.
- None of the above.
- Architect can be retested every 5 years or have his/her licensed invalidated. No need for IDP.
- To deal with bureaucracy.

16. Adoption of IDP by CAB, to include an exemption (or grandfathering) for any candidate currently in the exam process with the Board, should (check only one)

Happen as soon as possible with no changes to IDP.	130 (26%)
Never happen.	218 (44%)
Happen with the following changes to IDP: _____	103 (21%)
Comments _____	

COMMENTS

Happen as Soon as Possible With No Changes to IDP

- Grandfathering should happen. I am not familiar enough to critique the requirements.
- If this were adopted, I definitely think the current candidates should be exempt.

- I only have the California Supplemental Examination left to obtain my license here. I am concerned about receiving reciprocity to practice in other states that may require previous IDP training. This needs to be addressed.

- CAB could evaluate candidate credit equivalent to IDP. Do not have to go through NCARB.

- The adoption of IDP should not be included in my exam and licensing process. My current office is where I plan on staying which requires me to be licensed ASAP.

- Those who have started taking exams should not be required to fulfill IDP requirements. To become a licensed architect is harder than any other profession, considering the pay, or being a doctor or a lawyer. Why is it harder for an architect to become licensed?

- Candidates currently passing exams and soon ready to take California Supplemental Examination should be exempt of IDP because these candidates are already in the system and are succeeding.

- Those in the exam process should be given IDP credits at no charge, or be given exemption from IDP in other states.
  All IDP fees should be waived for all those who have completed the 3-year internship program as set forth by CAB.

- Why is IDP so complex? Why so expensive? I believe that my personal self study to take the exams coupled with my long term work experience will allow me to become a competent licensed architect. The question I have about IDP is whether it will produce better architects?

- Happen in the future, allowing folks who have been planning to get their license without IDP to be exempt – 4-5 years from now to include people who are in school.

- The whole idea of IDP is to have consistent exposure in all participating states. Any changes to the composition of the IDP program would alter that.

- Future architecture graduates should be made aware if the IDP program will be required when they leave school so they may find firms that already use the program or will start as a condition of their hiring.

- Do not change the rules in mid-stream.

- I have been working for 5 years – post BArch. I think if I were required to pass IDP, it would be as if I had never worked. This would be unfair. IDP should only apply to new graduates.

- If the IDP is adopted in California, all candidates in the exam process should definitely be exempt. I think IDP is another expense and barrier to not only the candidate but the employer as well – especially for small firms.

- I'm currently taking my written exams while working full-time and overtime and would hope that I would be exempt from providing and paying for further proof of eligibility to take an already costly exam.

- IDP should only affect candidates "beginning" the training process only. It is already too late to change those who are current under the exam process.

- I certainly don't feel it is appropriate to make people who have begun their licensing exams to join the IDP. At this point, I would gain nothing by it than paying more money. I cannot afford to create more paperwork. I've already learned what IDP is intended to teach.

- I have been practicing as a principal/design and drafting for 22 years preparing residential Type V projects along with many others. I feel that IDP is not necessary for this type of practice.

- There should definitely be reciprocity for those currently involved in the testing process! It would be unfair to change the rules in the middle of the game.

- Only if the exemption allows me to complete the requirements for licensure under the current system, without additional requirements by IDP.

- I definitely agree with, as I have already passed 8 of 9 (haven't heard the latest result yet) and have all required IDP experience and then some!!

- I have already passed certain sections of the exam and do not want to backtrack or pay the fees associated with the IDP program.

Never Happen

- Adoption of IDP would do only one thing to your candidates – add cost and unnecessary paperwork. People will report required hours in IDP regardless of actual experience.

- If well written, exams (ARE and oral) can be used as the best way to test a candidate's knowledge and competence in all areas of the practice. Employers, generally speaking, are not willing to make extra effort to provide candidates with those trainings required by the IDP. Therefore, can burden interns in their process of licensure. Furthermore, in my opinion, IDP units do not necessarily mean that candidates have earned the knowledge and experience we will all learn in the practice as architects.

- This should remain a voluntary program for those who need a structured internship and for those interested in national practice. Let the intern choose their own path!

- I believe that the ARE and California Supplemental Examination and the experience required for them are adequate challenges/requirements for becoming a licensed architect.

- Ambiguous – IDP should never happen or exemption should never happen?
  I will REFUSE to participate in the IDP program as I study and take my exams!!!

- I believe the IDP process will only add cost to an already expensive examination process and create unnecessary paperwork to lengthen an already lengthy process.

- It's an unnecessary burden for all. The exam and current experience requirements are ample to demonstrate competency. It's already a long, difficult, expensive, arduous process.

- In my experience both during school and afterwards, it is not fair to force an individual to qualify in certain areas of training if the firm he or she in interning with does not practice that area. Does IDP expect the individual to quit his or her firm merely to satisfy IDP requirements? This is unreasonable. I believe qualifying for the exam and passing it are sufficient to indicate a person is qualified as an architect.

- Some of us, stay home moms, cannot afford to work to meet the criteria of IDP.

- It is very unclear how the two internships (IDP and NCARB intern experience) differ. Will a candidate have to do double time? What if all the candidate's internship is full-time for 3-1/2 straight years under a licensed architect, would the candidate have to do additional time for IDP? This overlap needs to be clarified.

- Because architects and their assistants already work harder and longer (hours) than other professional people. The threat of lawsuits and the ever increasing demands by local governments are making architecture a tortured profession, plus also raising cost to our clients. IDP requirements should be satisfied at the school level or by individual motivation. The small residential firm I work for has not the time or the money to meet many more additional requirements. The truth is we're burning out ourselves as it is without another layer of institutionalized and insensitive governing bodies. We might survive if IDP is not mandatory.

- California is already one of the most difficult states to become licensed in. The addition of an IDP requirement would discourage people from becoming licensed and possibly force people out of an already difficult profession.

- I am currently taking the exams, but have completed my hours for licensure. It would seem unreasonable to now make me re-acquire the time.

- It's already too complicated for the whole exam process. It just creates more paperwork, more stress, and drives more people out of the architecture field.

- Do not adopt IDP. Do not change the rules midstream for those currently qualified to take the ARE whether they are currently in the exam process or not. Most of us (currently qualified to take the ARE) are working with financial/social obligation. The IDP would severely affect us. Working as an intern (after many years on the job) would be a financial hardship and would close the potential for taking the ARE forever.

- The IDP, as currently set up, is far too complex and flawed beyond repair. It is, however, a good concept and I would support a more workable system that puts the onus on the architects, not on the interns.

- A guideline for things that interns should be learning is important as a GUIDELINE only. The reality is that the ARE and CSE are extensive enough that a person competent enough to pass them should be considered "experienced" whether or no she/he has all the "Learning Units" required. The IDP program only delays intelligent people from taking and passing the exam when they are first able.

- If IDP is adopted by the California Board, then those candidates already in the exam process should be exempt. Otherwise, it would be extremely difficult and time consuming to backtrack and document past experience at firms.

- I have moved from Michigan. From experience, interns and supervisors can never fulfill all the IDP requirements, like Project Management – which firms gives an intern any experience with that? People often lie on the IDP program. I think the exams are enough to make you an architect. You do not need IDP attached to it.

- If someone wants NCARB certification, they can take IDP. But it is an exorbitant and unnecessary road to California certification.

- I do not think that a professional degree should be required for licensure. I think the route for licensure should be many and varied with years of experience under a licensed architect and passing of the ARE as sufficient preparation and proof of competence.
  I am also highly put off about the cost of IDP. If adopted, this NEEDS to change.

- Adoption of IDP should apply to candidates now who are not eligible to take licensing exams only.

- I believe it should remain an optional program for those candidates and employers who believe it is valuable. I also believe it is important not to limit the experience potential architects have open to them to only employers who offer IDP.

- Instead of IDP, I feel a period of "on site" construction training in candidate chosen area.

- I have found that the ARE does not test for competency in architecture as much as it does competency in test-taking. The IDP similarly ensures time-exposure (to the degree that employers only tell the truth to state boards – but most are willing to perjure themselves) rather than any qualitative exposure or competency in the materials. The State of California has always set trends through independent analysis and solutions. It would be wise to continue this trend rather than adopt a program out of a desire to ease interstate reciprocity.

- I believe broad and in-depth experience is important in the internship process but hindered by the institution of IDP. This experience depends on relationships and not jumping through hoops or filling out forms.

- I think there are already enough hoops to jump through to prove your level of competence to become a licensed architect. The categories IDP requires, in my opinion, are covered anyway during the intern process. Of course, it would be optimum to have had all those hours in each category, but to set a minimum for 16 categories and to expect the firm that you're interning for to keep track – that's asking too much and could turn off good firms in taking interns.

- Question is unclear – basically, I feel IDP should never be adopted.

- I firmly believe that the "mandatory" concept of IDP lessens the initiative of the intern for responsibility for gaining knowledge AND conceals from view the true nature of the employer's willingness/enthusiasm for mentoring AND the cost of the employer's involvement is justifiably passed onto the employee (reduced compensation) as a practice standard. This leaves the employer with no flexibility in the cost or manner of mentorship.

- The combination of school and work experience should prepare any person to practice architecture. IDP is just another unnecessary step brought on to create a bigger organization at NCARB, giving jobs to those who can't teach or practice.

- I very much would like no changes while I am in the exam process. Each change (even in the exam itself) causes unnecessary problems!

- The exam costs enough already without IDP.

- I do not understand this question. I do not want IDP. I don't think it's anything but a political money-making scheme for states. I think once approved by CAB without IDP, one should not have to do it.

- No need for IDP, just increased red tape and increased fee cost for candidates. ARE and supplemental exam cover bases well and intern requirement without IDP adequately. PLEASE NO MORE FEES!!!

- My understanding of IDP is that it is merely a paper-generating process, increasing neither employer participation in intern growth, nor increasing intern understanding of the array of "architectural" tasks.

- Takes too much time and doesn't allow enough time to study for exams. Tests don't relate to actual experience.

- Too much extra paperwork, fees, and hassle to an already difficult exam process. Interns already gain experience in these areas. I am almost done with my ARE and would not like to have to go back and record my work experience.

- The IDP program should be an individual's choice.

- It's a ridiculous, bureaucratic process that wastes time and money of all parties involved. It should be the intern's responsibility to ensure they have experience in all the areas they feel are necessary, and should feel free to control their experience as they see fit and without additional involvement and expense of regulatory boards.

- I am against IDP! More money, more waste of time.

- I believe IDP is just a waste of money. Experience in an architecture firm is invaluable. Requiring training in specific areas, while a good idea, is too easy to fake. Also, if area requirements were to be adopted by CAB, it would be only fair that they allow candidates to complete, retain, and transmit their records. As it is, IDP requires candidates to do all the foot and paperwork and then charges them to simply hold and transmit their information. Why can't a candidate do this?

- IDP is an attempt to overcome the failings of the educational system. If adopting IDP is necessary for reciprocity in other states based on current system, so be it. But overall, I think IDP is a band-aid approach to a larger problem.

- It can be adopted by an already licensed architect in California to be more prepared or more marketable to a firm, but it has not to be mandatory.

- I do not believe adoption of IDP is necessary and will create an unreasonable hardship for candidates both future and currently in the exam process.

- Too much bureaucracy already in licensing process. Also, process is already too expensive.

- Creates unreasonable barrier and extra unnecessary expenses to obtaining the license.

- IDP is just a way of NCARB making more money. It also creates an unnecessarily lengthy process for future architects to go through. I do think that you should have an accredited degree to take the exams.

- Using IDP as part of mandatory licensing would be ridiculous! Just another way to profit from the process and hinder the licensing process. DO NOT LET THIS HAPPEN.

- Given a cut-off date as 1st of January 2000 for new candidates applying for ARE.
  There is always cut-off date to implement new changes or new laws, and sufficient time should be given for the candidates already beginning to and/or taking the ARE examinations to be exempted from IDP.

- More unnecessary paperwork to add to our already busy lives.

- Now you are loosing too many architects with the adoption of the IDP. Nobody is going to take the exams to become a registered architect. You are creating a barrier to getting the architect license.

- IDP does nothing but add cost and time to the process of registration. You spend at least 40 hours over a span of a year trying to get all the red tape organized – it is not worth it. You gain nothing out of it.

- I think a structured program along the lines of IDP creates a rigid, narrow-minded role for an architect. Architecture is an organic profession that grows, changes, and develops thanks to an open-minded approach to who and what an architect is.

- Too many changes have taken place during the exam preparation process which makes it confusing.

- IDP should be optional in all states. NCARB is suspect and should be dissolved. Reciprocity should be automatic. Too many requirements and safety nets weakens the profession. The marketplace should be allowed to winnow out the incompetent, as it does in any unregulated industry.

- Candidates with more than 10 years experience should not be required to go through IDP. The reason they're not licensed is due to the time and obstacles in the way. IDP will just be another non-teaching hurdle for them.

- I don't think IDP should be adopted here – office experience is office experience. I've seen IDP in practice and it's no different than regular experience. From what I've seen in 3 offices of IDP, it is not a "structured" internship but an extra administrative step that costs money.

- Knowing how unwilling most firms are to expose their people to the management/construction administration-type duties until their employees have years of experience, I find such in-depth exposure a difficult requirement to fulfill. This in-depth exposure would be highly beneficial however.

- The IDP program is a costly development assessment to entry-level professional and may hinder the candidates from applying to take the ARE.

- IDP does not ensure advanced education but rather additional expense for a bureaucratic process. Testing and experience alone should be the measure. Based on this adoption, I personally would probably not be able to complete the requirements because I could not afford to reduce my income working for the architects on an intern level.

- Experience is the best instructor – but a forced program with point/hours in certain areas will only encourage people to move around to different companies just to get their "points."

- The IDP program should get with people who are just reaching the exam requirement. One who's in the process of taking the exams seems unfair to have to do IDP because it takes more time.

- It is difficult for the firms these days to take the time to do IDP because they are too busy running businesses. Also, many firms do not hire for the long term, only per project. There should be more done at the schools. To be well-rounded, an intern may need to work at several types of firms – residential, commercial, interiors, etc.

- I have worked in 3 states – all of which have no IDP requirements. I hope California does not adopt the IDP.

- IDP would be limiting a candidate's chances to become registered because not all firms and jobs offer exposure to all required training areas. Not all candidates get the opportunity to gain exposure to all areas throughout their career.

- If it is adopted, there should definitely be a grandfather clause.

Happen With the Following Changes to IDP

- What do they teach in university? Should this be covered by an internship during studies?

- Do not require all training areas. Allow an overage in one area to "count" towards another (to a degree).

- No professional degree requirements.
  California's 8-year credit system leaves the door open to more candidates.

- Don't make current people taking exams have to adhere to the IDP standards.

- Drop the degree requirement from a school!
  From what I have seen in 21 years of drafting is that college does not prepare you for being productive in the office!

- IDP should be omitted entirely.
  Some of the best learning experience can be had in the small 1-2 person firms. IDP is something that would not likely be compatible with this environment and so negate their experiences.

- General knowledge of the various categories is a good idea, but strictly issuing credits for hours worked isn't flexible (i.e., an intern isn't likely to develop contracts of fee structures) more flexibility is needed.

- IDP must accommodate candidates who work under licensed architects, but in firms which do not specialize in architecture, for example, interior design or building contracting. IDP tends to suggest that passing the licensing exam by itself guarantees minimum competency. I am particularly concerned about capping hours in Training Setting "B" to 465.

- Allow for employment credit under a registered architect before the third year of a NAAB program. The 1-year requirement for NAAB professional graduate program as an IDP entry point is unreasonable. For NAAB undergraduate – entry point should be after completion of one year as it is common for students to work in architecture firms while in NAAB programs.

- Allow non-college degree candidates to take ARE.

- That all certified employment forms submitted to CAB by candidates during the ARE process be allowed to be included and counted in IDP records for/of employment as/during intern status. This way we don't have to go back and get certification from previous or deceased employers.

- This program, if adopted, needs to be mandatory on firms which have interns, otherwise, few firms would want to spend time and money. Thus, making this program even more difficult to finish all 16 parts and requirements. Young and new graduates have little power in the market.

- If internship has been completed, you should be allowed to take the exam.
  It seems very bad for the architecture profession in general to make it more difficult to be licensed. If it were mandatory to have an architect stamp on plans, perhaps. As the law is now, what INCENTIVE does a designer have to be licensed, when he can design residential structures with <u>NO LICENSE</u>!! The number of architects is decreasing – why make it more difficult to become one?!?

- Too much paperwork.

- Work experience should be accounted for if individual shows knowledge of any training areas.

- I would need more information to give an accurate answer.

- The main concerns are costs and the ability to get the experience in all areas.
  I was enrolled in the AIBC (British Columbia) intern program when I worked in Vancouver, Canada. The two main issues were the costs (a lot of money to take the required courses) and the time and difficulty in getting the experience in all areas.

- Professional training should be introduced earlier in the intern's career, perhaps as a formal part of an architectural school curriculum in the form of work-study credits. It should be possible to graduate with a Masters of Architecture and an architect's license. The process, while certainly valuable, does tend to be lengthy.

- Exempt before end of 2001. After that, those "old professionals" may with requirement of 60-65% as long as they can be traced back.

- Cost is too expensive.
  I am afraid of the additional barrier imposed. Under current system, I am eligible to receive my license in California. Under new system, I start again from square one and I have to lose years of intern credits.

- IDP is generally a good idea; however, should not be a limiting factor in a candidate's process.

- No membership fee and lower exam fees.

- Abolish duration requirement. During economic downturns, many of us have been faced with limited job availability. During such times, we work short stints, but can still accomplish many of the 16 areas required. Why prolong the process?

- 1. Fewer requirements, with more responsibility on the candidate to acquire the knowledge. The proof will show in the exam results.

  2. No extra cost to intern (<u>no</u> additional licensure fees).

  IDP concepts should be structured into architectural education curriculum so that interns can be prepared. Candidates have different goals and methods for acquiring knowledge/experience requirements for licensure. This should be taken into consideration.

- Lower fees.

- Fees should be reduced and other experience should be considered, i.e., I work in a construction defect forensic office. I'm exposed to a lot of design and construction flaws.

- Allow registered California architects to gain NCARB certification in a manner other than completing IDP.

- A re-evaluation of cost of the tests and IDP membership in a practice where interns are rarely reimbursed for costs.

- Allow for persons who have not attended accredited programs.

- Reduce the ridiculous 700 units to a more manageable 300 units. Part of the IDP process and units should be earned and exercised during the 5 [th] year of architecture school. This IDP program will further foster the climate of oppression and exploitation that new graduates face in architecture firms (such as offering wages that are 1 or 2% above minimum wage, with no benefits and no job security).

- Reduce total length of program. A ½ year (full-time employed) is sufficient to understand the practice. Education continues the rest of one's professional career. Candidates can negotiate better contracts outside the IDP program and the "cost" of education should not be just the candidate's responsibility. (700 units = 2 years!? = too long)

- Should be voluntary – if a candidate can pass the exams without it, they should be allowed to. Though it may be useful, it should not be mandatory.

- I think it should happen, but I do not have enough experience with IDP to completely know the advantages or disadvantages.

- Not all firms/companies provide full architectural services (specifications, etc.). I believe that the knowledge and understanding and exposure of all categories are important to new candidates as well as architects, but I believe that there should be classes or seminars provided to gain or continue exposure to all categories. Continuing education experience classes could be offered by AIA.

- Fees are insane – there is no reason for high processing or yearly renewal. Go to h***.

- On education – allow a person educated with a non-professional degree to receive NCARB certification after completing all other licensure requirements.

- If IDP entry points would include credit for non-NAAB accredited degree program and work experience.

- Lessen the total hours/credits required to complete.

- Allow some credit towards the licensing requirement for experience as currently defined. Allow some credit for work on a project-by-project basis.

- Exemption and/or grandfathering is a must.

- An adjustment to allow for small firms that do not work on bid documents or are large enough for office management.

- Eliminate duration requirement.

- Provide a method for those not involved in IDP to get credit in areas for past work experience.

- Minimum education and experience should be high school diploma and 8 years under the direct supervision of an architect. Architects have trained other architects through apprenticeship for thousands of years. Mandating ivy league education (NAAB) requirements as the basis for entering into an apprenticeship program should not be considered as acceptable to CAB. California made NCARB change the ARE, and now is the time to make NCARB change its good old boy mentality. Having a 5-year degree does not make you a better architect.

- Modifications to the minimum requirements of units required in any one area.

- NCARB or CAB should enforce all the supervisors/firms to support IDP. Any supervisors of IDP participators have the obligation to advise their employee to go through their program. Although, the employer has not all the 16 Training Areas, NCARB or CAB will provide an advisors list or network for IDP participators to choose from.

- It should be much more flexible, inexpensive, or should be optional.

- Make it less a retroactive proof of work completed. Find some way to lessen cost and paperwork.

- Reduce fees!!!! Require fewer mentors outside current office. Take IDP out of the hands of NCARB.

- There should be a grandfathering and a reduction in fees for either IDP or ARE.

- Happen ONLY with the following changes to IDP:
It is not practical to have it so categorized. It could be a more general rule of practice, boosting the obligation of each employer to teach their craft.

- It seems excessive to charge money for compiling our IDP record – we pay enough for the exams alone! Also, it is <u>never</u> clear anywhere what compatibility/incompatibility there is in licensure in different states which mandate IDP.

- Shorten the time of IDP – 1-1/2 - 2 years (maximum).
  I hope that CAB can provide some classes for IDP candidates.

- The required areas of experience and duration are difficult if not impossible at many architectural firms. Many firms offer a glimpse of certain areas, but a meaningful participation can be cost-prohibitive to the employer. The areas of experience and required duration need to be loosened.

- Streamline the paperwork to make documentation easier/faster for employees and employers. Grandfathering of current candidates is essential.

- IDP should be a period verification (3 years, 5 years) for any architect (licensed or not).

- Fee changes.

- Investigation into the actual value of this program and the hardships that smaller firms will incur.

- More information to those involved.

- CAB should keep option available to take ARE prior to completion of IDP with IDP as a requirement for licensure. Some boards require IDP to be completed <u>before</u> any portion of the ARE can be taken.

- I don't think it is necessary to make IDP mandatory in California. In general, pass rates for the exam are up, without much difference between IDP and non-IDP candidates. I work in a 3-person office and so am getting tons of experience in the 16 areas. It would definitely present a hardship to a small firm if IDP were to be mandatory because the bookkeeping and working in certain training areas eat up a lot of time. I can see that IDP should help an intern to have a well-rounded experience and not be "lost" in a huge office, but in many ways, it is impractical for the small firm.

- Not require a professional degree in architecture to be NAAB-accredited. 4-year architecture degrees should be able to qualify.

- More flexibility within program. Allotted hours in specific areas may be too high.

- Years of experience should take precedence over areas of IDP as many smaller architectural firms do not practice all areas of IDP.
  Available employment opportunity or lack thereof may make it impossible for many interns to get jobs to meet every IDP requirement.

- Candidates with degrees (5-year professional) from countries other than the US and Canada should not be discriminated against by NCARB. The EESA-NCARB certification creates an unnecessary financial hardship ($700 or more). In addition, the documentation required for that kind of certification is extremely tedious, often impossible, for a candidate to provide at the time.

- Those graduates with minimum of 3 years of experience and current candidates beginning examination are exempt from the IDP requirement. All new candidates, not yet graduated from an accredited college/university, are required to participate in IDP program. This program, because of its cost, should be subsidized by the state government.

- Less rigidity in IDP requirements depending on type of architectural work. Residential work differs quite a bit from commercial work.
  For the current low pay and long hours interns receive, the fees and demand of adding IDP to current requirements would discourage most from continuing.

- Consider non-professional architectural degrees.

- Some of the requirements are truly unreasonable. No intern should be negotiating contracts (for example). It also appears to be simply a place to spend more money for people who don't have it. For a big office, IDP may be necessary, but in my small office, I have easily accomplished my requirements in 3 years, but won't be applying because I already put $1,500 on my credit card for the ARE and don't feel that it's worth more money.

- Reduce the high fees. Provide structured forms or software which facilitates the tedious record keeping. Place more responsibility on the firm.

- IDP cannot be required for candidates in process or for those who have competed 8 years or more and may apply in the future. With education and experience over several years, it would be very difficult for me to reconstruct, realistically and accurately, training with prior architects.

- Two main problems: the fees are too high; the "advisor" requirement is silly. Also some of the areas of training are not available to junior, non-licensed architects. Some offices don't cover all of the areas of training. It's a nice idea to make candidates well-rounded, but there needs to be more flexibility. Reciprocation is a big plus.

- IDP should be encouraged on a voluntary basis without expensive fees to the candidate or supervising architect.

- Decrease cost.

- Require the candidate to complete only the sections of IDP pertinent to the sections of the exam not yet passed. Candidate should be able to get license if he/she is no longer working under direct supervision of licensed architect (if previously qualified, grandfathered).

- Further review of Training Settings A and B with leniency on work environments, and further review of duration of employment with leniency on short-term and project-by-project work.

- An additional requirement for construction experience, and allowance for volunteer, construction, and rural project experience.
  Architects used to be master builders who had mastered the trades first. Today, we are little more than accountants with liability relationships to contractors.

- IDP should be introduced within the academic setting. Have the schools help in "preparing" one for the professional world as many other programs do (law, medical, social work, urban planning…). Architecture schools need to do effective internship programs! One of the best things CAB or NCARB can do is to expose the 16 areas while one is studying architecture, not only when one is already practicing it.

- Less paperwork and less money. We interns do not make a lot of money so we need to work 3 jobs just to pay the rent.

- Make it voluntary, not so expensive.
  IDP is a good idea, but it should not be required if the exams can be passed without it.

- Way too strict. Grandfathering is key!!

- I would personally benefit from grandfathering this program to those of us in the examination process, but I don't believe that IDP benefits anyone other than NCARB. IDP is just membership in a group that collects fee for the work (mentoring) done by others (employers). The "work" done by NCARB compiling the Council Record is typing the forms completed and verified by the employer. I think this program would be meaningful if it were truly a mentoring program, there is genuine value to teaching and learning. If NCARB mentored architectural interns, then NCARB should be paid for their services. Rather they want to be paid for a service they don't provide. Isn't this stealing?

- Except with the fees and an employer incentive program to encourage participation.

- Grandfather current examinees from the IDP requirements.
  Plain and simple – CAB's adoption of IDP will bar me from obtaining a license.

- Only be adopted if it counts all past confirmed architectural experience and does not impose duration requirements.

- Duration clause is unreasonable. Better record keeping by governing agency.
  NCARB needs to develop a way of keeping track of work hours. If you regulate the requirement, then you should regulate more of the process. The divisions make record keeping a daunting task.

None

- In theory, IDP is a great program. However, by requiring IDP, you would discourage and create much hardship in obtaining licensure. Ten exams and 8 years is difficult enough. Perhaps, IDP can be simplified.

- Should be more structured and comprehensive. Should not become a bureaucratic exercise in paper shuffling; otherwise, it does not meet its goal. Perhaps should be a study to re-evaluate the goals and procedures to achieve those goals.

- Exemption of IDP if the person has enough time (3 years) under a licensed architect, but has not passed all parts of the ARE.

- IDP should recognize those candidates with non-accredited degrees.

- Include only those who register to license after the IDP program is adopted. It should exclude all who have completed required work requirements and maintain a file with the state board. It would be unfair to require those who have completed their work requirement to participate in the IDP.

- Allow current, qualified candidates for the ARE to not have to have ID status. Allow us to maintain eligibility to begin taking exams.

- Not sure.

- Not sure if IDP is a good idea. If adopted, current candidates should be grandfathered.

- Not sure what my opinion is.

- I do not agree that it better prepares one to practice architecture outside California.

- I feel candidates currently active in licensure taking should have the opportunity to elect or not elect participation in IDP. A major drawback to IDP is that typical candidates and registered architects spend a lot more time in education or working than is compensated later in the profession. Further education, less compensation is not a goal people will pursue happily or with the expectation of a rewarding career.

- It should not be mandatory as some person may have previous work experience in other countries.

- If CAB adopts IDP, yes, it should include an exemption for candidates currently taking exam.

- IDP should not be required; but if so, it should include an exemption for any candidate in the exam process.

- IDP should only provide guidelines for tasks and not mandatory hours for each.   Most interns I know lie about the hours they fill in and it's useless.
  I think IDP should be scrapped. It only provides discrimination among your peers.

- Reduce those charges – it's a <u>racket</u> at the expense of the trainee.

- ARE training categories (A) Design and Construction Documents, (B) Construction and Administration, (C) Management, and (D) Related Activities? It really needs to be clearer.

- Reduction of fees and a re-evaluation of the units required.

- Unclear as to what you're asking. An exemption should be extended to those who are currently taking exams, or those who completed the requirements before IDP adoption.

- Adoption approval with existing candidates "grandfathered" under the existing CAB guidelines.

- I am in favor of grandfathering in an exemption but am not in a hurry to adopt the IDP.

- Remove/reduce fees.

- This is hard to answer because IDP record keeping fees are very high. Before getting licensed, it can be hard to pay the fees. After getting licensed, what's the point of having the fees?

- Confusing question.

- The expectation that an intern will encounter the 16 areas with any degree of comprehension is suspect. The reality, as I'm sure you are aware, is that most firms use interns as CADD monkeys and gofers and do not want to bother with the involvement required to really do the proper training. Firms want "someone else" to train their employees. I believe IDP is basically a sham to appease the "gray beards" and idealists in AIA.

- Candidates already in the exam process should be exempt from IDP. Period. IDP is a great outline, but I wouldn't want it to box in or prevent other more valuable experiences.

- No unreasonable fees. At the moment, fees cost over $500 if you should sign up a particular time period. Too much! That's equivalent to =/- 5% of an intern's take-home salary.

- Take effect in 2-3 years with grandfathering.

- I have no opinion.
  Since I was never involved in IDP, used a combination of architecture, construction (GC), and construction management (CM) to reach my experience requirements, I would be concerned that this type of experience would not be applicable.

- The question is poorly worded and confusing. If IDP is adopted by CAB then a grandfather clause should be in place for anyone who has started an internship, allowing them to complete without IDP, to be able to get licensed as they have been led to believe through school, up till now.

- How about some compensation for all the training and schooling we go through now. Architects have no respect! 8 years of schooling and training to 25K – Do something about that!

- Again, I do not have enough information on how the IDP works in other states. I do agree on the exemption, though.
  I would like to know if employers will use the IDP to gain some advantage over the interns. What about the viability of the program if and when the economy goes sour?

- I do not think will prepare better candidates.

- Cost of IDP is prohibitively high, on top of the doubled cost of the exams themselves since 1997 (and I do not buy the argument that computer/flexibility actually reduces costs...let's talk about one bidder to develop that program).

- Becoming licensed is cost prohibitive. Has anyone evaluated cost of licensure versus average income of interns?

- The ARE should test a candidate's competence in all 16 areas. The IDP list is worth knowing so that an intern can make sure they get varied experience, but this will work OK as self-guided if it is all covered on the ARE.

- In concept, the program is good. In practice, it can be an impediment to licensure. So far, all exams and processes only prove one's capacity to pass requirements, not the intent which is to create competent architects.

Training Settings

For the next two sections, please complete your responses based on your actual experiences if you are participating in IDP or have completed IDP, and based on your anticipated experiences had you participated in or completed IDP.

Under IDP conditions, interns are limited to the number of training units they may earn in a training setting that does not encompass all of the 16 training areas contained in the IDP Training Requirement. CAB is interested in your experience with or your opinion about this condition and its effect on your internship.

17. **Did you ever or would you ever have had to turn down an employment opportunity or leave an organization solely because the time allowed in a training setting had been "maxed out"?**   **Y** 148 (30%)   **N** 194 (40%)

COMMENTS

No

- 0 at the beginning of school.

None

- I cannot answer the "Would I..." questions given the recessions we've had; I don't know what I "would have" done.
- I can't comment – I've worked for the same firm almost my entire career.

18. **Did you have or would you have had any internship training in a setting that could not be counted toward IDP because the maximum allowed time in that setting had been exceeded?** **Y** 190 (39%)   **N** 137 (28%)

19. **Was this condition or would this condition have been a hindrance to completing your internship?** **Y** 222 (45%)   **N** 104 (21%)

<u>**COMMENTS**</u>

Yes

- <u>Obviously</u>
- <u>Absolutely</u>

20. **Do you believe training units should be able to be earned for experience within any of the IDP Training Requirement areas if it is received under the direct supervision of a licensed architect <u>regardless</u> of the work setting?** **Y** 317 (65%)   **N** 38 (8%)

    Comments

<u>**COMMENTS**</u>

Yes

- To be forced to change firms and lose seniority while preparing to take the ARE/NCARB exams would be a hindrance to my career.
- I think this should require a written description/verification from the architect and intern on how the experience fulfilled the requirement.
- Practically no individual architect personally works in all 16 IDP Training Areas (slight possible exception for those doing custom homes). <u>Every</u> architect specializes to some degree – Why should every aspiring architect have to run hither and yon for irrelevant, marginal "exposure"?
- All practical/technical experience is valuable and should be acknowledged.
- Architects work in many professional contexts other than just architectural firms. Landscape architecture, interior design, graphics, etc. all benefit from having licensed architects at their firms, even though these are non-architecture work settings.
- IDP requirements will definitely become a factor when employees assess their job/employment and decide to seek out new opportunities. It will also be a factor in deciding where they will go.
- Any experience (even bad experiences) are valuable learning tools.
- No one is going to get experience in all 16 categories without comprehensive, integrated practice, regardless of whether a firm engages in all 16 categories. It may be hard for all interns to get work in such practices.
- Again, why make it harder to become an architect? If one can pass the exam, they know what is needed to practice!

- A diverse profession requires an open framework to achieve it. CAB should not care where the competency comes from, so long as it is demonstrated.

- Again, there are certain areas such as bidding and contract negotiation that, in many firms, an intern would not be privy to such proceedings.

- Experience with engineers, landscape architects, planners, and contractors should be encouraged!

- Yes and No. Yes, in an ideal world where every firm has its own training school, huge budgets, no deadlines, and no one ever requires any sleep. The real world answer is No. Where is the time and money coming from for small firms and even larger firms to meet these requirements? Small firms already don't want to or can't have interns in architecture because of very real money and time constraints.

- For California only. National IDP should remain the same.

- Yes, even in architecture school.

- The sooner the intern can be shown what an architect's responsibilities are the better.

- Some of the training settings are so precise as to preclude this option. But if the work being done applies to that IDP category, I don't see a reason to forbid gaining units if it is under a licensed architect, regardless of location.

- Past work should be credited. Under IDP, they're not valid. IDP is expensive, so I avoided it.

- IDP attempts to write hard-and-fast rules and definitions for a profession in which no such rules have been agreed on. Training in whatever area interests the intern, passing the exam, and professional judgment once licensed should be all there is.

- Absolutely!

- It is amazing how much you learn in the first few years after graduating. Just being within the working environment of an architectural office is very educational.

- My firm is only involved in production housing – bidding, programming, cost analysis are handled by the clients. I do not have "exposure" to these areas and it would be difficult to receive.

- Why wouldn't it?

- 1. Offices taking advantage of interns.
  2. Friends and favorites get their paperwork signed without true experience.

- Other professions prepare you to be an architect – other than positions under a licensed architect, i.e., field construction jobs with subcontractors, computer graphic jobs, and even marketing positions. All architects should be required to work in field construction – outside the supervision of a registered architect. Most interns have no clue to how a building is actually constructed!

- Also, I believe that IDP could act as an effective continuing education program if it were voluntary – tied to some advantage for future practice skills – certification of particular skill sets – as a way of assisting employers with placing interns in effective positions.

- Working in a good architectural firm should give a candidate plenty of chances, and it should also be left to the individual to learn on his own.

- Why do you try to make another school? If you believe I need more "training units," why not put them while at an accredited school?! Program – IDP is great, but it should be totally voluntary.

- There must be consideration to the value of the type of work the firm is involved in. Unjust to the candidate who is fulfilling their goals still.

- The architect should sign off for the intern and assume responsibility for stating that the intern, to the best of his knowledge, has completed said categories of IDP.

- No two architecture firms are alike, so logically, neither would their focus of their projects be similar. IDP needs to recognize that all interns have different goals/focuses in their training and encourage that rather than regulate it!

- Passing the exam is the most important item, not "earning units." It should be the decision of the intern regarding preparation for the licensing exam.

- How do you address working for a GC or CM, experience that some may say is more valuable than working in an architecture office?

- Of course! For example, if a firm does all 16 except for building cost analysis, I don't see how this would devalue experience gained in CD, DD DWGS, etc.

- Because it should be incorporated into the education process.

- The requirement should be about the quality of training not the setting. I could get excellent training from a competent architect who works for a construction company, for example. There are areas I would not be exposed to (programming maybe), but then I shouldn't get credit here.

- It all seems unfair – small firms, which I prefer to work for, are at a definite disadvantage.

- An intern's knowledge base is dramatically increased by the experience of working in a firm and is exposed to many of the IDP training requirements in an indirect manner.

- Architecture does not solely occur within the confined area of an office/work setting.

- One's ability to pass the ARE should prove one's ability to be an architect. IDP should be a training guideline.

- As long as it is architecture related and practice related (not scholastic in nature).

- A licensed architect has met requirements by the state to practice architecture. In my mind, that is the most important aspect to an intern.

- Question is unclear. Experience should be counted both within a professional practice and for volunteer work supervised by an architect.

- A firm can be highly adept at all categories except 1 or 2. For instance, a firm that does interior build-outs would not do site and environmental analysis, but everything else.

- I believe IDP creates an overly rigid structure which shortchanges the benefits and synergy inherent to organic apprenticeship. Those who complain of getting stuck in a job pigeon-holed should learn to stand up for themselves, instead of relying on the big brother at IDP/NCARB.

- There are many volunteer opportunities to work with architects on helping to improve our communities.

- I believe so because people move from job to job for a variety of reasons including the choice not to be in a "comprehensive" work setting.

No

- I think the IDP training will affect the size of the firm you work for. Many large firms will not allow employees to do such tasks as construction observation. This will make young employees feel they need to quit their jobs to succeed.

- Employment in the professional firm is indispensable – while this requirement might be relaxed, it should not be eliminated. (Requirement of working in a firm with the 16 categories or portion of them.)

- Some smaller offices may not encompass all of the IDP training requirements. That licensed architect should be able to identify which requirements would not be covered so that the intern can obtain an understanding from alternate sources (i.e., seminars, literature, classes).

- Variation is essential for learning.

- I think there needs to be some motivation to change the candidate's focus from one subject area to others. The candidate should be aware and responsible for the need to change.

- Lots of work not under licensed architect, can do design work as well. So many designers on the available market do design work with no license, including building owners.

- Every experience in life is by default, to one degree or another, a "training unit." If I can't pass the exams, I shouldn't be called an architect, regardless of how many "formal" training units I have.

- There is no reason to use the IDP in California.

- Reduced training units should be allowed if the applicant receives training under the direct supervision of professional engineer.

None

- Please – read these questions! The IDP is going to help make/develop fine bureaucrats. Like many bureaucratic systems, the "process" becomes more important than the product.
- Don't know.
- Don't understand question.
- If you can earn training units for the experience within any of the IDP areas under the direct supervision of a licensed architect, it defeats the purpose of IDP requirements.

Duration Requirement

Under IDP conditions, interns must be employed at least 35 hours per week for a minimum period of 10 consecutive weeks or at least 20 hours per week for a minimum period of six (6) consecutive months. This is the "duration requirement."

21. Was this requirement or would this requirement have been a hindrance to completing your internship? **Y** 121 (25%) **N** 256 (52%)

COMMENTS

Yes

- As a woman, by the time I finished school and started working, it was time to raise a family. I do not have 40 hours a week to work and raise a kid. IDP should think about "ALL."
- If I were still a student, maybe.
- - Cost
  - Time to administer and manage
  - Potential loss of jobs
  - Singles out only qualified firms

No

- But I still think that there should be no minimum "duration."
- I have almost completed my 8 years work experience requirement and have passed 4 exams. At this point, it would be a hindrance without cooperation of my employer.

22. In your opinion, the duration requirement (check only one)

Is acceptable as is.	164 (33%)
Should be eliminated.	112 (23%)
Should be amended.	29 (6%)
At least 20 hours per week for a minimum period of 10 consecutive weeks.	36 (7%)
Other, please specify	21 (4%)
Comments	

COMMENTS

Is Acceptable as Is.

- Architecture at the intern stage should be a rigorous employment setting to prepare interns for the realities of practice.
- This requirement sounds reasonable as you cannot learn if you are not present and counted on by your boss.

- The required depth of training is unclear. The work experience requirement would supercede/exceed any 6-month period. Here, I think longevity with one firm is important but difficult to monitor.
- I agree with this requirement – deep immersion is necessary for valuable experience. Temporary work is close to worthless.
- I think that exempting current candidates in exam process would be the fair thing to do.

Should be Eliminated.
- With the frequency of employment changes, this requirement seems outdated.
- For C***** sake! Let the work be done as it is actually <u>needed</u> by the project/firm.
- IDP deprives non-architecture firms, which have licensed architects on staff, from hiring candidates because they don't offer IDP.
- People learn and pick up experience at different speeds.
- Any experience in architecture should count. You do not lose the experience by not continuing for a specific duration.
- 20 hours a week for a short period of time with a great architect who will teach and guide an intern through the process is better than 7 years with a sh**** architect who is a poor instructor.
  One positive aspect of IDP is that the program <u>forces</u> an employer to provide varied training to interns. An intern is not "pigeon-holed" into one specialty. The quality of an architect's experience depends on the employer and their attitude toward the profession. Personally, I sought opportunities with wonderful architects who would provide me with the opportunity to acquire those skills. I'm <u>grateful</u> I have not had to undergo the added expense or paperwork required for IDP training.
- Why make it harder to be licensed?!?
- Short-duration jobs provide valuable experiences in areas usually not possible when a student or with little experience.
- If IDP training requirements were mandatory, as to "duration," most interns and architects would be forced to become liars. I don't honestly know any one employer or the principal of any architecture firm who isn't already striving to keep up with the newest requirements that are necessary for a lawful professional practice.
- Experience = Experience. How many rules do we need to make for ourselves?
- I don't believe having a duration requirement would result in a candidate being more or less qualified; it all depends on the individual's personality.
- This would limit exposure if short-termed opportunities came up for an intern.
- As an intern, I often worked 50-60 hours a week – many hours would not have counted under IDP.
- Every area of practice is important and should have some exposure – mastery is another matter. Perhaps a candidates could demonstrate focus areas of practice as does the practice/business world.
- Experience is useful however it comes along. You are only penalizing hardworking students/candidates if you employ any duration requirement.
- Why is working part-time a concern?
- If hours are going to be counted, TOTAL hours should be considered, not the manner in which they were scheduled! This doesn't consider flexible scheduling or multiple jobs. This again overly limits employment/experience opportunities! The notion that a small amount of time spent at a firm is "worthless" is absurd! Interns should be recognized for all of their work time!
- Sometimes, economy plays the roll of the job situation.
- This requirement is extremely limiting for the professional decisions of candidates.
- IDP should be incorporated into the education process.
- Duration requirements could make completion of IDP during a recession very difficult. All hours should be eligible toward satisfying the requirements.

- The duration requirement discourages students to work during breaks and would delay the licensing process. Many students jobs are under 20 hours/week or 10 weeks long.
- Units should be accepted no matter how unsteadily job opportunities permit them to be earned.
- Give us credit for time worked regardless of duration.
- It seems arbitrary. If the training units required are met, what is the need for any duration requirement?
- This rule appears to unfairly penalize summer employment in office which is valid for professional experience.
- This requirement discourages contract work, which is the way of the future. Tomorrow's architects are more entrepreneurial, self-reliant. They should be trained in a manner that encourages those traits, not dependence.
- This requirement is fine for IDP as long as other opportunities were also recognized.
  Many opportunities are based on project durations of less than this.
- I think the way that the CAB requirements are set up now are fine and 3 months on the job experience isn't going to make a real difference. Time and experience of 8 to 16 years makes a difference.
- All architectural experience under the direction of a licensed architect should be counted.
- I am in the process of taking exams. California's program is fair in its assessment of candidates and I hope I will be grandfathered. My main problem with IDP is that my degree (B.E.D.) is not recognized as a valid architecture degree and was never grandfathered. I wish IDP would recognize the B.E.D. I am not planning to go to school for several years to meet IDP's requirements.

Other / None

- In a firm, it is impossible to direct what area your training will be in.
- Probably needs to be longer period of time.
- I once worked full-time at a firm for one year and then cut back to half-time for about four weeks. What reason is there for this four weeks not to count? Requirement should be clarified.
- 40 hours/week minimum
- Not sure.
- Duration requirement should be 10 weeks regardless of number of hours. Consistency in the number of hours worked is what is important. Credits earned will be equivalent with hours worked regardless of rate of accumulation.
- Again – This must be made more clear. Not just so many hours/week, but how time is allocated. Many students rely on their vacation period to go towards their internship, now what?
- To be worthwhile, this would have to be much stricter. Something on the order of full-time for two years. Only those who are committed to the profession as their way of life should be granted licensure. Those of passing interest should not hold licensure.
- Don't know – I was hired for my expertise in historic preservation and would have been hired by this firm in any case.
- No opinion.
- There is clearly value to long-term experience, but there are also opportunities for valuable experience in project-by-project jobs. Why not require some long-term and allow some short-term.
- 32 hours per week for 10 weeks
- 1 year (more experiences)
- Some duration of supervised experience is appropriate and necessary and useful. Unfortunately, given my experience of a firm's organization, it's a good thing there were all those nifty study guides to explain what the heck I was supposed to be getting from doing CAD input for 3 years.

- I'm not sure what the requirement should be. How do you judge someone who works 40 hours a week for 9 weeks versus 35 hours for 10 weeks? Significant experience does depend on exposure, but who is to say which type of exposure works best? Someone could perceive that a project-by-project basis would be more beneficial.

- Should allow a petition/review process of short-term employments (10 weeks or less). Perhaps a participation on a competition project or someone who is hired as a consultant.

- 40 hours a week – full-time

  20 hours a week – half-time

  If a candidate can't maintain 40 hours a week for a 3-8 year period throughout their entire career, then maybe they are not cut out to be an architect.

- Should be as the CAB already allows, as little as 2 weeks of 40 hours per week work.

- California should not use the IDP.

- To anticipate project-by-project hiring many offices practice.

- Summer jobs.

- It should take into account work by students who have to work part-time, but are still in school.

- Change 10 weeks to 7 weeks. A summer internship, or temporary position can offer useful experience, and should be counted.

- Too short. An intern ought to prove his/her worth by being able to uphold an employment for minimum 12 straight months. Too many interns have a hard time staying employed due to lack of construction knowledge.

- Should be however long it takes to complete requirements.

Overall Comments Regarding IDP

Comments

COMMENTS

- I studied and worked for 7.5 years in Germany. I was licensed architect there. Only working here for 3 years. I probably do not know enough about the education in the US to answer these questions.

- The educational requirement for a professional degree would create a financial burden for many still paying off the cost of their undergraduate degree.

- Essentially, I believe as it exists in California, IDP serves its purpose. If I feel "pigeon-holed," I suggest IDP to my employer. If not, then I'd prefer not to have to do the paperwork.

- My main concern with the IDP is its limit on professionals supporting families and trying to receive their licenses. The IDP works well for students, but I couldn't switch firms at this point to fulfill the requirements without damaging my career. The work experience program in effect is flexible yet seems to provide enough time (8 years) to get all the needed knowledge for ARE tests and practical knowledge for working.

- It's difficult within a firm to structure the exposure to be precise. You can be exposed to all 16 areas, yet not realize it. This program may place undo hardships on an individual, along with a firm. A program like this may discourage others from pursuing their license. Had I needed to participate, I would not pursue my license. It also creates another financial burden on a person. It's already expensive enough to test.

- I believe it is a great program, but the cost is a little high.

- The more you know, the better off you will be. Most offices do not provide all 16 areas of the IDP, so other avenues must be provided to complete these requirements.

- With firms so busy with work, I feel an employer would sign off on training not knowing if the intern really met the requirements. Essentially, the candidate is receiving the same training by working for an architect but spends more time and money by signing up for a required intern program.

- It is unfortunate for both employers and candidates as far as I am concerned. One cannot mandate employers independently of the work needed to be done on a project at a particular firm. It will only make candidates more of a liability than they already are for the employer.

- In theory, the IDP sounds ideal; but in reality, it will add yet another big, huge burden towards licensing. Not only will it delay licensing, but it will have an economical impact as well. Salaries will yet remain low for longer.
  If exams were eliminated and only the rigid IDP program were to be required, like in Europe, architects would obtain the practical training required, which we would then put into practice.

- DO NOT IMPOSE (ADOPT) IDP!
  IDP is an obstacle, pure and simple. Friends who have jumped through all its hoops describe a system they have to beat, not a system that brings them to any greater understanding or enrichment. The CAB and ARE are already onerous obstacles to licensure (especially ETS's inadequacies). Do not jump on the IDP bandwagon as a further deterrent to the bright, talented young people already abandoning the profession in droves.
  Don't make being/becoming an architect so unattractive that our status resembles teachers'.
  Don't force young people genuinely excited by the field to pay the salaries of NCARB. We're already paying plenty to CAB, ETS, and Sylvan Learning Centers! Do you remember how little money we make and what California's economy (= cost of living) is like?

- The costs for enrolling are high. The benefits are unclear. Mentors need training to be truly useful. The intent of the IDP make sense, but most people I have spoken with who have been enrolled in it question the benefits and feel that all the documentation is just more hoops to jump through on becoming a registered architect.

- I do not feel the IDP program has to do with the needs pertaining to practicing architecture in California. It has to do with reciprocity to other states. I feel this is an unnecessary hardship which should not be applied to all architect candidates in California but only those architects who wish to work outside California.

- Generally, IDP limits the employment opportunities for candidates because they are forced to work for architecture firms which offer it. It, on the other hand, restricts the opportunities of firms practicing related professions such as interiors and landscape from hiring candidates who would otherwise offer valuable skills. In the end, the issue ought to be whether a given candidate can pass the exam.

- Is IDP necessary? More paperwork, more time, and more money. As interns, we make less money than someone working for McDonald's or Taco Bell. Starting off at $25,000 a year is peanuts. There is no incentive for the extra cost.

- Not a necessary process. It should remain optional. This creates more formalities and in some cases barriers which do not always encourage or support the importance of the exam and licensure.

- IDP is a good model – It should be established in California. It needs to be presented more aggressively by firms. IDP inaction for ARE qualification should not be the precursor of an eventual requirement of a NAAB-accredited degree prior to taking the ARE or licensure. This would turn away many potential candidates educated in allied or creative fields as well as those who, for economic reasons, have chosen to work full-time in architecture and thus not take a NAAB-accredited program.

- I feel IDP, in general, is not a bad program, but I don't feel it should be required for licensure. It is another unnecessary cost to the candidate who is already paying increasing costs to examine. It should be up to the individual candidate to expose themselves to and gain the required knowledge of those facets of architectural practice on which the ARE is based. Why is California considering the requirement of IDP? Is it merely because 44 other states do? Or is there concrete evidence and/or feedback from past IDP candidates which proves IDP to be a great success?
  Perhaps the fees should all be paid by the firms - ?

- It's too expensive to complete and maintain.
  I would've participated in it happily if it were affordable.

- Do your candidates a favor by not imposing additional cost and paperwork which is useless. If a candidate works with and learns from a licensed architect, 3 years that you require should and would provide sufficient training for licensure, whether he or she is in IDP program or not, whether he or she is filling out papers or not.

- IDP should benefit/facilitate candidates in getting better training opportunities from employers and not charge high fees.

- I think the intern fees are too high for the application and maintenance for records. Most intern are dedicating their funds to the ARE exam fees, exam seminars, and licensing fees.

- Forces people just starting out in the profession to maintain their status as "intern" for too long. By forcing an employer to "train" an employee in all the different aspects outlined in IDP, you are forcing on that employee a minimum pay scale – Indentured Servitude. The cream will rise to the top. Get off the high horse and let us work.

- I am currently completing my ARE exams with my supplemental exam scheduled for late spring or early summer. My license is a crucial part of my immediate future and promotion to partner. IDP would potentially become one more item to complete and a financial burden. I could not afford this to happen.

- IDP does not seem to allow for experience in non-traditional settings, such as government service, and required participation may deter public service-oriented individuals from pursuing such a career if doing so will prevent them from becoming licensed.

- Why "fix" what's not broken? IDP can be a good program for those who choose it. Don't make everyone adhere to a program that is not for everyone.

- I am not in favor of California adopting IDP.

- Overall, I think IDP is a good idea if some of the exam requirements are cut back and a grandfather clause is put in for examinees who have already started their exam process. (They should not have to be involved in the IDP process, only new candidates.) I don't think a competency test should be given for licensed architects – this is why we have Consumer Affairs/Better Business Bureau.

- None. I think it is for some people but should not be mandatory. In my case, I am involved in all aspects and should not bother with "satisfying" the IDP.

- I think it would be great for anyone just graduating. For anyone who has been working for 3 years plus and already taking the exam, it would be UNACCEPTABLE and a major waste of time.

- I will oppose IDP if it adds any expense for interns, who are generally grossly underpaid. The expenses of licensure, especially the exams, are ridiculous.

- I don't think training/interning should be controlled by a national organization. I don't think it should be mandatory to enroll in said organization to take the architectural exam.

- - Not recommended.
  - Too expensive.
  - Requires interns to switch jobs in order to achieve all IDP requirements.
  - Limits design firms of interns for a duration.
  - Causes design firms hardship of limited interns.

- Architecture is a dying profession! Less and less people are following the path of becoming an architect. The pay is too little (for the cost of school and training). The AIA needs to be revamped and laws should be passed to require architects to stamp all building plans. Make the architect necessary to the construction process, then think of improving the IDP process.

- In addition to my comments on Item 16 objecting to the adoption of IDP in California, it has been my experience (in Boston, MA) that the unreasonable amount of paperwork required to complete the IDP creates an atmosphere where participants are dishonest in filling out the forms requiring the fulfillment of the 16 training areas, supported by employers who sign off on them. In no way does IDP guarantee that interns get the varied experience IDP purports to ensure. I believe that the 3-year internship and examination process in California is sufficient to ensure qualified applicants.

- IDP is too specific and requires too much of already overworked interns.

- The intent of IDP is commendable; however, don't the 9 ARE exams test an individual's knowledge of all areas of architecture already? On top of this, IDP would only add financial burden with the ARE's. Most individuals at an intern level in the field of architecture do not have the salaries to support such an expense – unless the employer contributes.

- I think structured experience is a great idea. I worked for licensed architects for 6 years (following a BA in architecture) and was <u>lucky</u> to work in firms which offered a wide assortment of experience. Candidates should not have to rely on luck.

  I'm now working as a construction estimator to increase my knowledge of building because I think it will be very useful in architecture.

- They should "grandfather" in those individuals currently taking the ARE if indeed IDP would help in so far as reciprocity in other states. If not, I feel overall IDP is a drain on an already tight budget with cumbersome requirements.

- While I am not <u>currently</u> familiar with all of the 16 Training Areas, I anticipate that I will become knowledgeable in all of these fields by the time of completion of CAB requirements.

- The best way is keeping the current exam policy. Let the market decide architects!

- The application fee for IDP is very expensive for architectural interns. I would like to see a breakdown of the time and expenses that go into processing each application.

  NCARB needs to base its fee structure on a non-profit basis if IDP is to become mandatory.

- I think the IDP is good in order to get experience in all areas of practice. The problems are trying to get that experience and the time and money involved.

- I feel that IDP can be a valuable experience, if chosen. It should NOT be a requirement for licensing.

- IDP would create hardships for firms/employers and be a financial burden to candidates.

  Since I believe I have only a few exams left, when IDP is required please have an exemption to IDP for people as myself who are almost finished with the exams for architect licensure. I believe my seven years work experience along with my 5 years schooling have prepared me for licensure.

- I have received well-rounded training in the architectural profession because I have sought it out. I strongly believe IDP is a waste of time and money. The profession of architecture already requires a great amount of schooling and training that is not equally financially compensated for when compared with comparable professions. The exam is exorbitantly expensive and extremely long. Adding the time and expense of IDP just creates more inequality. In the profession of architecture, one never stops learning, why does it need to be so regulated?

- I believe it is a good program and will benefit our profession.

- I do not endorse IDP. Their service does not provide any structure for developing an intern. The exams are what determine the maturity of an intern into an architect, not a bureaucratic office holding a tracking file. Employers don't want to be bothered every week following up on credit forms, nor do the interns. Any intern could fulfill all requirements set up by IDP and not have the experience necessary to practice as an architect. That is what the exams are for. It is up to the intern to choose a path for training and to know what they need regarding experience. I would <u>never</u> pay for a service such as this, or expect anyone else to. It is a waste of time and money!

- With or without IDP, present day candidates invariably take approximately 8-10 years to become licensed. At the end, each candidate takes and passes the licensing exam. Rather than create/adopt a formalized IDP – which costs the states a lot of money – perhaps create different levels of licensure, much like engineers.

- Coercive regulatory requirements in our nation as a whole are detrimental. In architecture, it destroys creativity, quality, budgets, and intellectual honesty. This is a terrible legacy to future architects. Self-responsibility and integrity are what successful architects also practice. Almost all architects are diligent about all areas of their professional responsibilities and some even have a little time and money to train interns. A striving intern will learn the "requirements" of professional practice in time. The machine-like IDP training requirements as outlined in your correspondence will do little to advance this profession. Please consider these thoughts. <u>Thank you</u>.

- I have been in the process of licensure for over 16 years. I have a Bachelors degree not in architecture and have over 18 years experience working and functioning basically as an architect under the supervision of a licensed architect. I have completed all portions of the written exam and passed everything except Building Design. I have taken that portion 5 time and failed and decided to take a break until my daughter is not so demanding. The exam format has now changed to a computer format and I am in the process of preparing to take that test soon. I hope that after all this time, I still will be able to reach my goal. I hope CAB will allow me to.

- IDP is a bureaucratic nightmare. Its rules and regulations are ridiculous and frustrating. The idea of having to pay any agency to monitor my work experience is absurd. I am seeking professional license which requires work experience, in one form or another, in every state in the country, adding a monitoring program such as IDP will only end up wasting my time and money.

- As currently structured, the 16 Training Areas make IDP a comprehensive (good) preparatory measure. The only problem is that most firms will not provide opportunities to work in those areas. They say it is not cost-effective or time-effective (we're always under a deadline) to switch people onto new tasks once they learn the first task. Some firms do no work at all in some of the 16 areas. It is especially hard in a small town to find a firm that is willing to give opportunities in all 16 categories. Suggest alternate way of obtaining.

- Learning through internship can be aided by guidelines for architects with interns. With schools giving their students these guidelines as well. Not a bureaucratic, paper-impediment like IDP.

- I think it's too expensive – considering the salaries that interns usually make, and other expenses for licensure (i.e., $100 eligibility review, $1,000 ARE fees, etc.). It would be too much to add another required fee for interns.

- The learning unit system is too stringent, especially in today's work force. There are many non-traditional opportunities to gain the experience one needs to practice competently. If IDP is successful, it must take into consideration opening up options and opportunities beyond traditional settings.

- I believe that the IDP places an unnecessary burden of responsibility on the supervising architect of the intern. I am worried that NCARB has gained too much control over the futures of many talented designers and architects who wish to practice architecture outside their state of licensure. Please maintain California's independent status.

- Costs too much. Interns do not make much money, but are spending it all on exams, IDP, Associate AIA, seminars, etc. Why can't it be affordable so potentially good architects are not viewing architecture as a "poor" profession as interns?

- The IDP should be structured to fill in voids for those who never attended architecture school at a professional level. If, as in my own case, one has attended a recognized professional program in architecture, one should have covered most of the IDP material in school or work-study jobs affiliated with school and should not need to enroll in the IDP.

- Suppose I don't have a problem with it. I can see its advantages, but I would want to ensure that anyone already taking the ARE would be exempted from IDP requirements for licensing.

- Architectural licensing is already harder than equivalent professions. IDP is not necessary for the profession.

- I am having trouble as it is fitting in the necessary time into my schedule to study for the Architect Registration Exam – having already completed the required intern hours – the extra time to re-evaluate my intern hours by myself and my boss and my former bosses – plus the added costs. (You well know architects in general and interns especially aren't paid a lot and often have many loans to pay off for up to 7 years of education we have gotten in a desire to become architects.)
  Most architecture firms don't specialize and do therefore cover a lot of the areas required by the IDP – of course, some firms are hesitant to offer interns experience in areas such as Construction Administration. But if you are motivated and interested, you can gain exposure without formally being assigned these tasks. I have always felt it my responsibility to do so and don't need to pay for a program to "document" this. The exam is enough documentation.

- I believe IDP is beneficial to the State of California to ensure qualified architects know and have the necessary training to act and practice as professionals. With some minor modifications, IDP should be adopted.

- Being at the age of 40, graduated in '83, it is hard to collect the information. Some companies were gone, some architects were retired (or even retired from this world). Idea is good, but solutions may be needed to help those like me to rebuild the record.

- Overall, a great idea.

- It is unclear whether my BArts in Architecture-1990 from UC Berkeley satisfies their education requirement.

  I liked your survey. Keep up the good work.

  Do you consider a 1-year IDP "accelerated" evaluation time to be excessive, along with its additional fee? Yes.

- I do not believe that demanding a mandatory IDP improves the knowledge accumulated during internships. This knowledge will get tested during the NCARB licensing exams. It will only make it more costly, time consuming, and difficult, especially for graduates of a non-accredited school to get licensed.

- It makes it extremely difficult for those not working under the direct supervision of an architect.

- As a professional with several years working for architecture/engineering/planning firms, I'm against the IDP for those with years of experience, but who did not take the ARE. If the IDP were adopted, I would recommend the following conditions/criteria:

  - Do not require IDP for candidates with work experience/qualified to take the ARE under the current requirements.

  - Do not require IDP for candidates in the ARE process.

- The IDP creates another bureaucratic speed bump on the road to licensure. If incompetent candidates are passing the exam, make the exam harder. If competent candidates are failing, make the exam easier. If the same percentage of candidates are passing but fewer are taking the exam, ask what has changed – the exam or the candidates? Stop wasting candidates' limited wages and time on more fees and paper work.

- It is a good idea, but may become cumbersome to interns and employers. So the more flexible, the better.

- IDP would be a benefit to the candidate since not all architectural colleges/schools focus on the same preparation for careers. For example, some schools are more design theory-based compared to those which address the technical aspects such as codes, consultants, and construction which would contribute to a better understanding of the profession.

- My only other concern relates to possible downturns in the market making it economically difficult to satisfy IDP requirements – e.g., just because there is a recession and candidates cannot find employment with an IDP firm would bar them from taking the exam. Something about that strikes me as not being right.

  It is also possible for unethical firms to offer a lower salary to those who still need their IDP training (more so during recession than growth).

- I have no problem with IDP if it can be amended in California. I hate to lose all my work experience credit. I have an NAAB-accredited degree. This additional barrier IDP requires will delay my timeline for licensure because I didn't register for the IDP program. I find IDP to be very expensive so I avoided it in California. Now, I will be penalized because I didn't register.

- I believe this program would add unreasonable amounts of time and money to those of us already in the process of licensure; however, it could ensure that potential architects are receiving better training and experience.

- The idea of providing interns with a broad, well-rounded experience is a good one. However, the IDP is overly complex and places the burden on those least able to carry it – the interns. The profession must first agree on what makes one an architect and then write a system of training. The current IDP would exclude many talented and committed people from a profession already starving from lack of fresh input.

- IDP would lower wages employers would offer as "intern" label would apply. More "red tape" and paperwork involved. Professional degree should be requirement along with several years experience.

- Of the 4 objectives IDP was created to serve, only 2 are truly important to an intern such as me. That is enabling interns to better prepare for their careers as licensed architects and providing them with a guideline of activities. However, providing a formal means of evaluating training is really only creating more paperwork and costing more money. After all, this same objective is achieved in school by tests, so I submit that the ARE itself is formal enough to "evaluate" one's training. And as for recognizing an "intern's professional development," I believe this is better served when the title of "architect" is bestowed upon them – not before. If a person has twice as many "Learning Units" than are required but cannot pass the exam, what good has all the "record keeping" been?

- I think that the training requirements give an intern a good understanding of how to approach the working environments and experience to seek out. I strongly believe that this should be up to the intern to satisfy their own growth. The additional amount of time, forms to fill out, and money (cost) is cumbersome to people who have to work extra hard out of school, etc. and who commonly earn very little money. The exam itself has recently become very expensive, in addition to training seminars. How are interns going to support themselves? Only wealthy elite can become architects.

- Although IDP is a good way to ensure that licensure candidates get all areas of training. I believe that a candidate can obtain that experience without a documented process such as IDP. Especially since IDP, if required, is an added financial burden, and by a significant amount. Our salaries are low enough as it is; the exam process as is already costs us over $1000 to complete. We really do not need any added expense.

- My concerns are with people like myself who have been out of school for four years working for a small firm with 2 principals. I think I've received a well-rounded experience, covering every requirement in the IDP program, plus much more. Now will I have to go through the same requirements as new graduates. If not, will I be "grandfathered in" as hinted at in this survey? Or will I be tainted by not having done IDP, minimizing my experience with future employers?

  Also, the cost of my education, plus study materials, plus the increase in fees for the new computer exams, and now NCARB fees for both me and my employer are too much to ask. I attended a 5-year program and 4 years of work experience, shouldn't this be sufficient to be allowed to take the licensing exams. If my education at school and work are not sufficient, then I just won't pass. I believe the exams are a sufficient measure of a person's "competency" as an architect, the exams are thorough and extensive.

  If IDP is adopted and I am not grandfathered in, will my employer be allowed to backtrack and document my extensive hours in the 16 areas of experience or will I have to start over?

  If this program had been implemented when I first graduated, I may not have been opposed, except for the fees which are expensive for someone fresh out of school (making $10-15 an hour depending on if the economy is in boom or recession). But now I'm too far along to support IDP since I've exceeded the requirement.

- I do not believe that IDP is required. In my own experience, I have had exposure to most of the training settings without having been required. If the firm is not too big, you will get an opportunity to practice and be involved in most phases of training requirements.

- Working under the direct supervision of a licensed architect and architect licensing exam should be enough. As a person currently in the process, I find that the fees and work-related hours need not be increased as that becomes a hindrance to young, talented designers anxious to achieve licensure.

- I regard IDP as a hindrance to the profession. It could only enhance discrimination among your peers. The term "intern" is discriminatory. The office environment in architecture is very tense and competitive. People are so sensitive about their capabilities and knowledge of the profession. It's a very political atmosphere. I hope IDP will be scrapped all over the states.

- I don't see any difference between architects with IDP training and architects without IDP training.

- It's a burden both expense-wise and time-wise.

- The concept behind IDP is a valid one. No one wants to be stuck drawing bathroom layouts for months – but on the other extreme, no one want to be filling out paperwork for years. I believe professional life and trying to complete the ARE are both difficult enough without throwing in the additional personal administration required by IDP. My friends in other states, where IDP is required, have various complaints about the system. There is rampant cheating; and, in general, people feel that it is a waste of time. As a professional working towards completion of the ARE, I have made it my responsibility to insure that I get the necessary experience required to be a licensed architect. I do not need another governing body taking on this responsibility. I urge you not to adopt IDP.

- To the best of my knowledge, I have never worked with any company that used the IDP program. I've always been intimidated by the exam and many firms said, "Go ahead and start taking the exam," because of my varied experience in all forms of the profession and construction administration.

- Please don't bother.

- I am very disappointed that the CAB has decided to adopt IDP. Taking the computerized licensing exam is a long and expensive process as is and this only creates more fees and useless paperwork. I think in theory, that the IDP is a good idea, but I think that we are all adults and can and should manage our own careers and experiences without filling out checklists and having "mentors" sign off. This is a profession with examinations and enough requirements that more than qualify us to be architects. You are essentially reverting us back to an apprenticeship system.

- IDP is an unnecessary burden on interns.

- California should not adopt IDP merely as a way to allow architects to achieve reciprocity in other states. If experience and successful completion of the ARE are not sufficient to prove competence, then perhaps the ARE needs to be made more difficult or more tailored to what is learned "on the job." The variety of routes to becoming a licensed architect that currently exist should not be eliminated.
  The IDP program is restrictive and costly!! It will not improve the field of architecture.

- IDP can be helpful for interns who feel their experience should be structured to guarantee that they have their bases covered. On the other hand, it places a burden on employers, as well as on interns, that is unnecessary. A potential architect should be responsible, resourceful, and organized enough to guide their early careers to encompass the skills, knowledge, and experience required to become licensed. If they are not, and still are able to gain licensure, then why not make the test more difficult?

- I think it is a good program, but I am very happy that I have already begun taking the ARE. The tests are expensive enough as it is. Interns do not make a fortune!
  Thank goodness for grandfathering!!

- I think IDP is not necessary because if we had completed the experience requirement to obtain the license, that is already the best way to gain knowledge to be a well-rounded architect. We should not limit ourselves onto how many hours to spend on each of the 16 Training Areas. This will give an additional barrier to each individual. Instead of looking at it as a training process, we will look at it as a chart/table with numbers to fulfill and lose the main purpose behind it.

- I think that licensed architects would have a problem supervising interns and making sure that the interns are exposed to all 16 areas. How would the supervising licensed architect be obligated to do this training for the interns – will it be a voluntary or mandatory responsibility to the supervising architects? If voluntary, I think it will be difficult to get them to add responsibility to their busy schedule.

- IDP and NCARB requirements are supposed to be ways of determining a candidate's experience. I had 14 years in construction prior to entering an architectural office of employment. Thus, I've seen many examples of "signed plans" that are not practical, and in some cases, not cost effective. I believe that requiring construction experience for licensure would be more beneficial than the IDP program.

- CAB should not adopt IDP.

- I have worked for three small architecture firms (8 or less) all of which carried a variety of high-quality projects varying from residential to commercial to urban design. As part of a design team, especially in a small firm, each aspect of producing a piece of architecture, including the rigid format of IDP requirements, becomes your job. With construction budgets getting smaller and competition for work becoming more intense, principals have no choice but to use each employee to the fullest, and has little or no time to manage the paperwork mess that is the IDP program. Young architects who are driven to succeed, which each must be to survive in the field, will get skills they need to get licensure and experience on their own without bureaucratic handholding by IDP.

- The state would do well to determine what it is trying to accomplish before adopting the IDP. This program guarantees nothing and teaches only how to best deal with bureaucracy. This is, perhaps, valuable to an architect, so perhaps it has a saving grace. I fail to see how the IDP protects the well-being of the public.

  (As far as my own experience level goes, I am eligible for the CSE – this isn't in the hopes of having to avoid IDP, as I have passed this stage in California.)

- I have only one exam left – Pre-Design. I don't think the IDP should be implemented on those of use who have almost completed the exam process.

- There are many design firms which can operate just as an architecture firm would, creating great/successful projects for their clients. If an interior design firm, for example, had structural elements in their project, employing a structural engineer would be just as good, if not better, than if accomplished solely by an "architecture firm." Whether an intern completes the IDP program under the direct supervision of a registered architect or not doesn't necessarily make them more prepared. Many a bad designer/intern architect can complete the IDP program and become licensed and produce bad buildings.

- IDP will succeed only if an appropriate program that will assure that new graduate architects will be hired with a reasonable pay like physicians and employers take IDP seriously.

- I can only say, as for me, at the age of 53 that the IDP would not further my own awareness of the various subjects, since I have been involved with them all for nearly forty (40) years. However, I have worked for many stupid, inept architects; therefore, I would recommend this program for the youngsters.

- Good idea, but bureaucratic reality a nightmare.

- The IDP, from what I understand, seems like an excellent one for California to adopt. However, I think California could be more flexible with the education requirement. I do not have a degree in architecture; but in one year of working under an architect, I have worked well over 500 hours each in 4 of 16 training requirements. I think that for those who aspire to become licensed architects in California and who don't possess a Masters of Architecture or a Bachelors of Architecture, another alternative is to raise the minimum training requirements for IDP; maybe instead of 3 years of IDP, it could be 5 years. For example: a degree in architecture is a good foundation, but 4 or 5 years is nothing in a lifetime of architecture. I still hope to become a really good architect in the near future.

- Isn't 8 years of experience and college schooling along with 9 exams and 1 oral exam enough? I appreciate the effort towards mapping out what an intern is to cover, but this just adds to a long and expensive trek towards getting licensed.

- IDP is over-stated. For many years, before NCARB, architecture survived and architects flourished. Thanks to NCARB, the "process" of becoming a licensed architect is more important than the product of a good architect. NCARB with its IDP is a "no-value-added" process. The states have fallen asleep and the national big brother has taken over – too bad.

- IDP is an unnecessary program. All portions of IDP are already fulfilled in the current system.

- If a candidate cannot form their experience to meet exam requirements themselves, it will be reflected in the exam results. It may be good to have an interactive web site to help interns track their hours, but by no means should one have to pay the prices IDP charges. The ARE is already the most expensive professional exam and compared to starting salaries (lawyers, engineers, doctors) with comparable education requirements, the cost is not justified.

- I'm apprehensive about California adopting IDP. I really don't feel I should have to fulfill IDP after working for 5 years. It could add an extra 2 plus years to my internship. IDP should be exempt for those individuals who have been working for any extended period of time.

- IDP should not be a license requirement for anyone with a current testing history. It is inconceivable that someone would be required to track experience requirements back more than 10 years.

- I do think that IDP training should not be required for licensing especially for somebody who already has a license from a foreign country like myself. (I have been a licensed architect in Yugoslavia from 1993.)

- I'm not sure how this program will help. I have not attended a formal college – I went to a technical school and have worked for over 12 years in a large architectural firm. I am currently the Director of Quality Control for the firm, a project manager in charge of project administration and document production. I am not the only person in this category in the Fresno area that has a background similar to mine.

- I believe that IDP was invented by a couple of politically/economically motivated students (who did not go on the practice architecture) which answered (conveniently) the profession's concerns at the time for a way of handling the greatly increasing number of students coming into the profession, the rapidly changing technology, and the profession's loosening grasp on the field of construction. I believe that IDP has served as a distraction from the changing nature of the profession and has done a major disservice to interns while giving established architects a false sense of security!

- More Draconian regulatory hoops to jump through for an unrewarding and difficult profession.

- I think the IDP program at this level simply adds another layer of requirements and process to an already rigorous schedule. I also believe the requirements are unfair for small firms who don't have the "training time" allotted. Not to mention a substantial amount of additional fees for the candidate.

- I think the CAB is fine the way it is. Architecture in whole is a learning experience. You learn every day. The best way to learn the whole business is to keep working under the best architects and listen. Also, the individual needs to keep an open mind and teach himself.

- I feel it is a good way to receive thorough experience, although there is concern about switching from NCARB to IDP and documenting those work hours.

- Please, make it voluntary (as it is) – it serves very well. If you feel you want architects to be more educated, change tests and school programs. IDP is a very good idea and helps, if it is administered well in the architects office, but it can get "crazy" with "allowed time" and "units." Unnecessary obstacle.

- Good idea!

- Again, I believe it may be useful, but should not be mandatory. Architectural licensing in the United States is already regulated more than in most countries and this is perhaps appropriate. I don't believe, though, that another set of barriers is needed.

- I have been fortunate enough to have an employer which values training and mentoring without an established IDP program. I understand other employers do not have this philosophy; therefore, I believe it is a good method for interns to achieve their goals.

- I feel the IDP is a good program but should not be made as a mandatory requirement for all NCARB candidates. Within many firms, the 16 Training Areas are a standard part of the job. All can be completed as long as the employee is motivated enough and disciplined. I do believe that, as you near or begin this training (regardless of IDP), your work should be directly under a licensed architect. Many of the larger firms have lost sight of this. Also, I don't feel that a degree should be a requirement for either IDP or NCARB. Many candidates who have degrees don't have the job training necessary.

- California is already lacking good people due to the recessions that have hit in the past. It's an expensive place to live. No IDP is an attractive asset to the architectural programs – I worked in Minnesota where people were going through IDP. The units became a larger concern than the project and they couldn't always follow a project through and learned no more than the ones not going through the program!

- IDP should affect or start with those who are still in school. Whether we impose a system like the IDP or not, how much one learns will be more dependent on the person or what the office is willing to teach you as opposed to a structured system like the IDP.

- Another tax-money wasting scheme.

- It's just another way to charge money from an already overcharged and underpaid career choice. Good Luck!

- Regarding exam fees: getting very cost prohibitive! Please review the fees.

- Grandfather me in! I am the president of a 4-person design firm and would have to close my office to go to work for someone else to earn credit. Lose a ton of money and a great client list. This would create a huge hardship for candidates in my position.

- Almost all IDP licensed architects have told me that their experience with IDP was just full of hassles and large fees. I believe that IDP does not adequately balance work experience – there are just abuses and "fudging" just to make the requirement area fulfillment. If the goal is to prevent people from becoming licensed architects, then implement IDP. But if you are concerned with getting well-balanced architects in the California workplace, stay with the system you have.

- As a candidate that is nearing completion of the ARE, grandfathering existing candidates is a main concern/need.

- The IDP requirements package seem like a good concept except for those working for several years to meet equal credits to qualify for ARE.

- The IDP is a bureaucratic program of little benefit to the profession. The week-long test <u>taking</u> time and $1000 cost of the ARE are sufficient barriers to entry in a profession that has more than necessary.

- IDP sounds like a good idea for the status and practice of architecture, but I don't believe that anyone should have to be rich to become an architect. The way it is now, the cost to take your exams is a financial burden. There should also be set up a way that an intern at a very small firm has the possibility of exposure to all the required categories. (Back to the concept that not all architects practice full services.)

- Instating a mandatory internship program for persons wishing to become architects will bring this profession up to par with other licensed professions.

- Program doesn't seem worth it. Don't understand the purpose of the program.

- I think your fees are shockingly high. We architects, or aspiring architects, make rather pitiful amounts of money, especially just out of school. It seems unfair to require the associated fees you now propose for IDP. I personally don't feel any less for not having completed the program. (Perhaps my situation is rare – I don't know.)

- Education is key. To this point, I have not received information on joining IDP. Even in this mailing, there is no number for me to call to voluntarily join IDP. The fees are way out of whack. This is b*******.

- The program needs to be more discussed in schools and associations so that everyone understands its importance. Now, the cost of the program does not make it worthwhile to many employers.

- Great architecture used to come from talented individuals who were allowed to practice their craft. We've become a profession too structured and rigid to allow for any greatness. Instead of adding more accountability/management and record keeping, I feel that more effort be spent on educating our clients and making the building profession more accountable to those practicing architecture. IDP is just too time-consuming and costly to justify the promise of a well-rounded architect.

- May be a good thing, but if a state requires it, they should bear the burden of all costs. Licensing costs are extremely high and time-consuming compared to other professions that require a license.

- I do not see the use in yet another government-controlled aspect of our field with more paperwork and fees to pay.

- I believe the IDP program is and has been developed for a large-firm setting. Yes, an architect after becoming registered should maintain his/her competency, but I don't believe in IDP preparation for the ARE.

- IDP is beneficial and should be adopted, but should be enforced for new candidates only, not those in the middle of the internship status.

- This is my first exposure to IDP. I need to discuss this program with other professionals to further understand and evaluate. The size of the architectural firm would certainly influence program participation.

- Unfortunately, the reality of the workplace means that you are used where you are needed. Employers, interns too, do not usually get to select their tasks based on a list of requirements. Also, many firms do not cover an array of services that would fill the IDP requirements. If you work at a firm that specializes in restaurants, for example, an intern draftsman wouldn't do a lot of bid negotiation.

- I feel that the exam process is already bogged down in bureaucracy and high costs. To add more requirements just adds more undesirable bureaucracy and costs. None of the other professions (law, CPA, etc.) require a mandated "experience" track. Each person is a professional and should be personally responsible for their own experiences. Our profession creates so many barriers to entry as it is that creating more makes us more laughable as a group than before.

- The fee schedule is very punitive. The fees I pay to the local AIA as an associate member are already taxing on my disposable income. Why is everyone so insistent on driving intelligent, assertive, creative people out of the construction industry? You're setting the economic barriers to entry too high to become a licensed architect. The economic benefits are pretty dismal anyway. We might as well all go and build virtual realities in .com land. Sorry to be so downbeat – just reconsider the fee amount – too high.

- Currently, IDP is not required in California – so few (if any) of my peers are enrolled. Also, the employers do not see the need much (beyond speaking in ideals) because there aren't mandatory IDP requirements for licensure in the state.

- My greatest concern with IDP is how it will affect my process to obtain licensure. I have completed half of the exams and half of work experience required for California licensure. Will adopting the IDP void what I have already completed? Will it push back the date at which time I am eligible for licensure?

- Overly bureaucratic and costly system. ARE needs to be reworked to test the ability of the test taker. Practical, legal, business, life safety issues.

- Unfortunately IDP is just another money making venture that has proven to serve no useful purpose except create undue hardships to students/interns/minorities and bureaucracy. When IDP becomes mandatory for licensed architects, when IDP is enforced at the employer end – then it will work. As it stands, all burden is solely on the intern in terms of money, requirements, enforcement, etc. When is IDP going to really help – instead of hurt – interns!???

- IDP only for the new candidates who apply for the ARE. We already go through such a long time for ARE test. The ARE is too tough to be true already. There is no reason to put another barrier in front of us. That's not fair. We can't always comply with your requirements just because your rules are changeable. To us, it's not very convenient and not fair.

- From what I've seen with fellow employees participating in IDP, it seems to be more of a formality to complete. It does not appear to be as structured as it is intended.

- Common – Make the exams harder and don't sweat IDP. What are you afraid of, guys?

  It is not clear what the great purpose of IDP is...certainly, it is a clear outline of quantifiable activities an intern will, in most cases, need to follow in order to meet the rigors of licensure. However, what does IDP do other than serve as a "model code"? Stated differently, IDP, if formalized to the degree suggested, simply shifts the responsibility of meeting a minimum bar of acceptable behavior to the candidate instead of the academy or the firm or the state, then why have the exam? The bigger questions are:

  - Does the exam prove a candidate is capable of practicing architecture? Instilling IDP in California seems to suggest it doesn't.
  - Does the duration of experience (informal) prior to exams really provide background sufficient for a candidate?

  The costs for a candidate to obtain licensure include university education, exam costs, study materials, so called "exam seminars," and costs associated with no remuneration from employer while taking an exam(s). To place even more burden on the candidate by making them responsible for the costs of administering IDP is a travesty, barbaric; such a 1900's way of doing things.

- Integrate exam and IDP together, not as two separate entities. IDP may not be necessary all together. Make national exam, rather state.

- The need for experience with management could require changing jobs otherwise unnecessary which might make it tough to get sufficient time with one firm to achieve a management position.

- I would not like to see the IDP required in California. The extra paperwork and fees seem very unnecessary. If it is adopted, current ARE candidates who have already competed their work experience should not be required to back pedal and complete the IDP requirements, which would amount only to paperwork and fees.

- The IDP program seems like a good thing. However, I made a decision not to because I did not have the money and I did not and do not plan to practice out of state. If the IDP is enforced, there should not be any fee required. If it is mandatory and you do not pay your fee, what happens?

- Note: My 8 plus years of work experience was completed before IDP requirements were considered as national standards. Questions #9, 13, and 14 are answered for survey completeness only since I am not involved in this training process.

- Will CAB hold its ground under the pressure and help hold the line with the other remaining states or will this state buckle under the pressure? Only 44 states have adopted this program for a reason, and if California has to be the last state to adopt this program, then so be it.

- The IDP is an overly-bureaucratic, expensive system, which clearly has good intentions, but is too rigid to be a good measure of an intern's experience. I don't see that an intern gains any additional experience/knowledge more than a standard intern/employee. It should be solely the decision of the intern if they've acquired enough knowledge to begin the examination process. The "breadth of experience" requirement is something that should be addressed in schools if that is deemed so necessary. The discovery and development of architectural skills and knowledge is something that firms should foster with their own interns/employees, not having it imposed upon them by the state.

- There should be more flexibility within IDP to allow for cross training. For example: credits/units could also be achieved outside the current program, i.e., working for a structural engineer, landscape architect.

- Why isn't 5 years of school (sometimes 7-8 with Masters) and an expensive and extensive licensing exam enough?

- There are so many requirements already which must be met prior to becoming a licensed architect. I believe that the necessary school experience, work experience, and the ARE are enough to produce qualified architects. I would sincerely hope if California adopts the IDP program that those interns who have already begun testing (ARE) would be exempt.

- CAB and NCARB should do more for IDP interns to approach those training programs. As an IDP intern before, I feel hopeless to find any advisors or employers to sponsor my IDP. I paid a lot of money to keep record of the IDP, but got no support from all employers or organizations that included CAB and NCARB.

- I feel IDP is an expensive cataloging system, unneeded in the internship process. The process is bureaucratic enough and adding this layer would serve to cloud a very simple process of learning the practice of architecture. Internship training is about more than accruing an amount of units in a particular category. It is about being a part of a team where the entire experience is the learning process. IDP is wasteful and unnecessary.

- It's just another way for the AIA to make money. We would have to pay a lot of money for very little service. If IDP is adopted by CAB, and I sincerely hope it's not, CAB should at least consider engaging private firms (non architectural) to offer a program comparable to IDP so that there would be price competition for the services. As it is now, IDP has a captive market, so there is no incentive for them to offer reasonable rates and quality service.

- The requirements for IDP make it unnecessarily difficult to obtain licensure. While it is important to the profession to have experience in all of these areas, it should be up to the discretion of the candidate how it is obtained. By passing the exam, a candidate shows competency in the architectural profession. The IDP should be available but not required for those who are having difficulty obtaining all the necessary training. The system should provide flexibility depending on the individual candidate. As it stands now, it is limiting for the candidate's professional growth in that it limits for whom and for how long one can work.

- Not productive in its current form – waste of time and money.

- I would like to know if employers like the IDP in states where it is required. How well prepared are the candidates, anyway? How do those who have completed the IDP feel about it? Are IDP participants taken advantage of by their employers? Your letter and this questionnaire make it seem like a California flavor of the IDP is a foregone conclusion.

- Everyone I know who has completed/been involved feel it was a <u>supreme</u> hassle to revisit every day's task to verify its worth to a bunch of bureaucrats in Washington, DC.

- The education/work experience system currently in place does not reflect real world conditions and is onerous compared to other professions. How can I become involved in improving the education/work experience system?

- I am very uncomfortable with the fact that NCARB is a private organization with a monopolistic power over architects' lives. I think all aspects of licensure should be managed by the government.

- No states should <u>require</u> IDP. It should be used by individuals to <u>aid</u> their education. It would give NCARB too much power – power that individual states should have!

- It is already very expensive to be an "intern" between the low pay and the high cost of the exam. IDP is a great idea but the cost is prohibitive and is the reason I have not joined.

- I believe that IDP would be a burden to both employers and employees financially and practically. It's hard enough for most recent grads to find decent employment in this state without IDP. It also would present one additional financial obstacle for the intern. Small offices, where the intern has the greatest potential to learn, would be hardest hit by the messy IDP requirements.

- Majority of architecture firms are 1-architect firms with 2-3 employees. IDP is an unnecessary burden that they may not want to take. In small firms, employees do get all-around experience unlike large firms where they do only certain work. So IDP is good only for large firms. Before implementing IDP, you should consider whether more interns will have advantages or disadvantages.

- Right now I've been accepted as an eligible candidate to license in California as an architect. If IDP is accepted now, it will affect my possibilities to become licensed in a near future; and it is not too cheap. (I think it's expensive.)

- Please try to make it very clear how California's stance on IDP/NCARB licensure affects a) future candidates, b) candidates currently taking exams, and c) licensed architects who wish to practice elsewhere. Will there be "levels" of licensure? Will I be required to fulfill IDP requirements at a different state even if I have my license??

- I think the IDP should not be required in any state – it should be a suggested course for the ARE preparation. It is unfair that the IDP is now required by some states in order to receive reciprocity.

- I hope that schools or firms can provide more information for students. Also, CAB should give out more seminars to the firms that are interested in participating in IDP.

- While the intent of the IDP program is noble, the financial burden to both the employee and employer are formidable. Additionally, the excessive training requirements are at odds with a for-profit organization. A less stringent program would improve intern training and promote a more honest completion of IDP.

- The conditions for entry are too narrow. Interns who have completed education at a junior college or technical school level are just as qualified if not more qualified to be starting a career in architecture.

- IDP would be a valuable experience to any architectural candidate that is planning to take the exam. I believe all candidates currently taking the exams or passed at least one exam should be exempt from IDP.

- The concept is a good one but it creates unnecessary paperwork and bureaucracy for candidates in offices where they would receive the same experience with or without IDP. It should be up to a candidate to ensure they are getting the training they need, and the ARE exams should test whether or not they were trained adequately.

- I think this is a ridiculous hindrance to those of us who do not have a license yet!! This is just another measure to get more money out of us! Why would someone go through this? There isn't enough money in this profession as it is, and this only makes matters worse. I should have been a CPA...oh, well...

- The IDP should be an option for the California architect and ARE candidate. The ARE is one the most demanding exams in the professional world, the completion of it should be enough. This requirement would only further financial hardship on the candidate.

- It will be difficult for an employee to complete IDP requirements at my firm because my firm does not support employees changing experience.

- IDP requirements should be very easy for somebody who is working every day (architects) and, in my opinion, is a good verification for everybody. Thank you.

- So many programs that both NCARB and CAB develop are well-intentioned, but they rarely produce the desired effect. This IDP program seems to be one such program. It will cost those who have the least ability to pay even more money and appears to be loosely controlled. While I believe that new architects should be experienced, I don't believe this program will accomplish that desired effect.

- I believe anyone currently in the exam process having already completed some exams should be exempt from IDP if it is to be adopted in California. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

- Like many others, I'm not sure why IDP is seen as being "necessary" for reciprocity – especially if someone is already practicing as an architect in California. What does an NCARB "blue cover" really mean?

- California should stay out of the IDP.

- I don't see any benefit to adding extra bureaucracy to a process which is already cumbersome and expensive. Bottom line is: Can the candidate pass the exam or not?

- Again, cost. Let's be realistic about what an architect makes, much less interns. I'm not sure the program prepares candidates that much better. Perhaps in some cases it allows an intern to push for experience they might not be given otherwise.

- Don't get me started.

- Don't adopt it. It is an extra administrative step, it is <u>not</u> structured, and it's expensive. You are deceiving yourselves if you think IDP is any different than regular office experience.

- IDP sounds like another "weeding out" process. When business is as good as the last few years, no employer has time to document what each intern is or has been doing. IDP should be strictly voluntary. We have <u>enough</u> regulation and bureaucracy to last forever. Less is better.

- IDP is too costly for someone to get his or her architect license, and it does not necessarily prepare someone to become a good architect.

- I think that IDP in general has its heart in the right place – for interns in danger of being pigeon-holed in large offices or trying to take the exam who are practicing in a small town, or for someone who needs the added structure and discipline. But I also think the wide variety of options for professional practice in California, the diversity of the population, etc., make adopting 1 single internship experience very difficult. It is the job of the ARE itself to set the standard we all aim for. How each individual meets this standard should ultimately be left up to him or her.

- IDP seems to add more cost and more time consumption with little offered in return. If a candidate is lacking experience in any of the training requirement areas, that would be evident on the ARE exams. The exams are structured to test for the minimum requirements to be a competent architect. Why do we need to jump through more hoops and paperwork to prove our competency again (and at an increase in cost). Another problem with IDP is not all firms practice all the training areas. I would not be able to satisfy all areas. And what does professional and community service have to do with being a licensed architect?

- I think IDP is a good idea, but it shouldn't be mandatory.

- Useless.

- Those who plan to practice out-of-state and overseas would voluntarily enroll in IDP; therefore, I don't believe it should be mandated of everybody. I think many small firms, with limited time and staff resources, would be reluctant to take the administrative burden of IDP. A well-rounded training can be obtained in small firms with or without IDP.

- IDP is an excellent program to develop more well-rounded architects and better prepare interns for the ARE. However, remaining employed is still a high priority for most interns, and employment opportunities may not allow them to switch jobs as required to get to work in firms which practice all IDP areas. This could also discourage interns from accepting work in small firms which specialize or otherwise do not practice all areas of IDP. IDP will develop more well-rounded interns, but it should not be an absolute requirement – this would unfairly penalize interns who may not be able to fulfill all IDP areas because of an economic and employment environment beyond their control.

- IDP is just another scheme to make money and red tape.
  Just because other states require it is not a reason to have it.
  If someone plans to practice in another state that requires it, they can do IDP independently.

- For me, it doesn't make sense because of where I am in the licensing process. I have always had negative feelings for IDP and NCARB. I think that the idea is good but that it is basically a scam for money from interns who already have to pay too much to get licensed.

- Not familiar with the IDP since I have been grandfathered in myself.

- The plan needs to be integrated into the educational institutions. You must educate the students of all the "rules" when you decide what they are.

- The testing process is complete as it is and does not need to be added to.

- As mentioned under Question 16, candidates with a professional degree from another country are severely impacted by IDP's requirements. The California Board of Architectural Examiners requires a "general" evaluation by ECE (Educational Credential Evaluators) which is affordable and tests the syllabus and course of studies undertaken by a candidate and compares it to a similar program in the US.

- To improve competency of architects, you have to go to the root of the problem – schools. Architectural education, before the actual work "world" is what needs help. This process of forcing IDP as yet ANOTHER requirement upon architects is just a money machine for bureaucrats. And it is yet another ridiculous part of the fees we need to partake in. If you do this, you will discourage people from being licensed architects. But maybe that is your goal!

- IDP should not be imposed. If it is extremely necessary to have IDP, candidates who are already registered and in the process of starting to take the ARE examinations should be exempted as at the time of application for ARE, there was no IDP. New laws or new changes are possible and worked out for fresh candidates who are yet to start or file eligibility requirements for the ARE. Also, in the State of California, architecture has to deal with other problems like earthquakes and advanced study in that area to be incorporated and not IDP.

- It's a great program for recently graduated interns of 3 years or less (3-5 years experience being a recognized tier in the architectural field). It will, however, increase unreasonably the cost to everyone if implemented. The state should be required to subsidize the program for those with economic hardship.

- IDP appears as more unnecessary bureaucracy. Has CAB ascertained that its architects are a lower caliber than IDP-processed architects? If yes, what are other options? If no, why are we considering it???

- Not all candidates have the luxury of moving from one firm to the next to compete the 16 sections of the training.
  Not all firms have the ability to train or send their employees to training.
  Prepare and send a form that could be completed by supervisors to indicate the number and level of training on the job for individual candidates.

- IDP sounds like a good idea, but for most interns, it can be more expensive, tedious, and not worth the process to obtain a license. One must realize the compensation of interns is paltry – the compensation after acquiring a license may not necessarily be any better. If one must implement IDP, further consideration must be given to its cost and added pressures to the already saturated and complex profession.

- Alternative avenue, yes. Mandatory, no.

- I heard about the IDP in architecture school and I think it is a good program; however, for people like myself who only have a couple of months left to achieve the eight-year requirement for licensure, it would be a major hindrance to be forced to complete the program now. The fees are already high enough, plus I don't think it is fair to the licensed architect, who is only doing a favor to the intern, should have to pay a fee. I think it should be up to the licensure candidate to ask to be exposed to all 16 IDP areas without it being forced on them. Besides, you have to know those areas anyway to pass the exams.

- IDP should NOT be adopted in California, because the current licensing qualification procedures for this state allow candidates to begin the process without the hassles as for the states which currently require IDP. As starving and broke students and recent graduates, the fees for IDP would be absolutely prohibitive. The points system and mentor sign-off is a JOKE in this profession, and most candidates would more likely find some licensed architect that didn't give a d*** to sign-off on bogus paperwork. California already requires the supplemental exam, and a candidate would already have had experience in the 16 divisions in order to pass the exam. IDP is evil – another bureaucratic and unnecessary institution.

- Expensive. Bureaucratic way to attempt to force the kind of diverse experience one should seek out on one's own. If required, hours will be appropriated to fill requirements, regardless of task.

- Many of my friends in Oregon (where I got my Masters) are unable to get licensed even in 3 years because of the IDP requirements. Many even have more experience than I. I am confused as to the licensing reciprocity for myself without IDP. But I'm glad that I never had to fight it. The requirements are far too cumbersome and limiting and I'm sure have caused many people far more grief than should occur in a complex profession that pays very little.

- I don't like it and probably if it is accepted will look for new ways in my professional career instead of wasting my time in taking the exams to get the architect license.

- Is CAB having a problem with the current intern program, or is this to meet other states' requirements? The IDP program seems very complicated. Do we need to add, administrate, and pay for another level of bureaucracy?

- The objective for creating IDP is well intentioned. And for candidates not currently in the exam process quite beneficial. It is a hindrance for candidates in my situation that met the Board requirements, are now in the exam process, and basically have to re-qualify. Grandfathering for any candidate currently in the exam process should happen as a condition to instituting IDP.

- I feel the education of the architect should happen in school and then in a working environment. AIA Learning Units, IDP – these only add more expenses and burden. A professional should be self-motivated and interested in continuing education, but should not be mandated to.

- It seems to be a good program; however, it should be optional and not required. Architecture encompasses a vast array of experiences. Alternative aspects to the profession should be respected.

- If the total time to complete IDP is held to 6 months, its value would be far exceeded by years of experience. IDP's value may be verification of exposure to the 16 areas (all) rather than just a concentration in one. Forcing candidates to retroactively recreate prior experience would cause some degree of falsification of records or broad interpretations.
  IDP, to be really effective, should begin at the 5-year point and should last 2-3 years. It is unreasonable to expect candidates to go back once they have passed that point.

- Adoption of IDP would make it more difficult for young graduates to find work because many potential employers would be unwilling/unable to comply with the requirements. This program will also lower the already low starting salaries and add cost for interns.

- IDP should be accepted, but not required. Making interns jump through more hoops and send more money to Washington, DC make an already rigorous process even tougher. If a candidate wishes to gain licensure in other states, he may <u>choose</u> to use IDP. Filling out little charts and chasing architects around for signatures every few months will not protect the public or make candidates more competent. If California can change IDP, it may be worth requiring. How many interns are <u>really</u> involved in programming, for example? And does <u>ten</u> days experience make one a more competent architect?

- In addition to previous comments, I also think that it should be recognized that architectural knowledge, experience, and ability has/is/will be very difficult to quantify. We all know people/architects/interns that understand processes faster than others and some who never get it. I think testing for knowledge and thought process is more valuable than dictating time intervals. We all know architects who should not be licensed and non-architects who should be. Creating a grocery list/scavenger list of items will not improve that situation.

- I am glad I did not have to go through the expense and paperwork. I knew all the categories and made sure I got the experience and/or read up on all the subjects before taking the ARE.

- The IDP seems like a very good idea – up until now I have not heard of this program. But I do believe more educated and informed architects can only help serve the profession as a whole.

- I think schools should be more responsible in preparing students of architecture for the real world. Not the CAB or NCARB through IDP.

- I think IDP would enhance the knowledge of young interns, projecting to a more definitive guideline toward "architectural practice." It is unfortunate to be pigeon-holed in many companies and receive a stunted growth in professional experience. I think IDP should change this scenario and our seniors should have more of a mentoring attitude.

- Is California joining the other 44 states that require IDP for licensure to have bureaucracy tell them when a candidate is ready to take the exam? The fact is IDP requires too much paperwork and money. It isn't that the candidates are lazy. You know what happens when too much paperwork gets caught up in government. I, for one, am not pleased with this surprise announcement.

- I thought California had the backbone to stand up to the bully tactics of NCARB, but I guess I was wrong.
  Prediction: The goody-goodies who follow the rules of IDP in California will never be as successful as those who take the bull by the horns and do what it takes to follow their own dreams. CAB's endorsement of IDP teaches apprentices that bureaucracy is good, and I say this is a bad thing. "Accelerated Processing = $300"?! What b*******.

- Shouldn't be a requirement for becoming a licensed architect.

- IDP should not be mandatory.

- IDP may be another obstacle to the already tedious and exhaustive licensing process. The profession demands so much dedication and study time. The testing program tests not of knowledge of concepts and their practical application but a very strict and unflexible application of architectural knowledge not congruent with practical life. IDP will just add more red-tape than prepare candidates.

- IDP programs support urban-based practices with cheap interns. Most architects work on project-by-project basis and use temporary workers or contract help to fill in the seasonal highs. IDP seems to lack in overall experience training with minimal exposure to the faceted activities of successfully completing projects. IDP requires an administrative bookkeeping that works for mid-to-large size firms but probably results in undertrained architects for solo practice.

- I am worried that having 5 plus years experience but no documentation for IDP requirements may further hinder my current pursuit of licensure.

- Overall, the program is needed. There should be exceptions, however.

- IDP should <u>lose</u> the point system. The numbers seem absolutely random. Way too controlled. On the other hand, the 16 training areas give knowledgeable exposure to the different areas in each. Therefore, I believe IDP should be used as a <u>guide</u>, a basic standard by which an aspiring architect should measure themselves against. To make it mandatory is a waste of time, paper, and money. If it is adopted, it will not be taken seriously; supervisors will simply sign items off, and candidates will just be more frustrated with licensure. We already have to pay for the test. Why more money and time wasted?

  Please do not adopt IDP just because other states are doing it! If you really want to help candidates, start at the top, down – start with teaching professional and practicing architects.

- It's a great idea to have this program. I just wish I had more time and money to participate. Employers are so prejudiced about IDP because they pigeon-hole all the young interns. IDP gives the young interns the training that is so lacking in all architecture schools.

- This is another step to eliminate people from acquiring their registration. Testing for the ARE is expensive and time demanding. If a candidate passes the ARE, that is enough. We do not make enough money to jump through another hoop!!!

- The IDP is yet another large hurdle that any aspiring architect now has to deal with. It seems that the IDP is just another way to collect revenue at the expense of a group of people who can barely afford to take the exam as it is. IDP would also be a paperwork nightmare for both the CAB and the intern, as well as the architect; and there are horror stories of employers exploiting their interns just so that they may sign off on their hours. The IDP is a severely flawed attempt at regulating "competency."

- IDP IS USELESS. EVERYONE (no exceptions!) I know involved in it is forging their hours. Intelligent interns will seek out employment situations that develop and grow them into trained professionals. Have some FAITH that we are capable of making our way.

- I don't agree to paying more fees ($200 plus) to maintain the IDP for participants. Many can't afford this and also there has been increased fee amounts to the CAB exam applications.

- Still needs work. Real office experience 50 hours a week is the only real solution to building a good architect.

- Based on over 40 years in the building industry and dealing with architects on the coworker, subordinate, client levels and in my own attempt at becoming an architect – the best architects are made through years of experience in the field of their choosing. How do I go back to an employer from 10 years ago to get credit for code research (one night a week for over a year I have tought inspectors how to read the code books – no credit). I have 1 division remaining and 11 months experience to complete. NCARB rules after 6/30/2000, I would have to start over.

- Should not require in California.

- I appreciate CAB's desire to promote better qualified architectural interns, but I do not believe IDP is a realistic method to achieve this goal. If NCARB is genuinely committed to mentoring, they should become a "teaching institution." There are many obvious ways to accomplish this objective, the more obvious is to have faculty that are trained to teach the sixteen training units. I would much rather pay NCARB to learn than to participate in a pseudo mentoring program that is a possible burden to already very busy employers. I do believe NCARB should be compensated for providing record keeping service and facilitating nationwide reciprocity, this is a valued services that is beneficial to everyone. I cannot however support IDP in its present format. I would enthusiastically support an IDP program that incorporates real instruction provided by trained and paid faculty.

- The licensing procedure is expensive enough as it is! IDP is good for those people who need help making sure they get relevant experience at their jobs. I personally have not needed IDP and <u>do not think it should be mandatory</u>!! It is <u>too costly</u> and we are not in a well-paid profession as it is! Unnecessary for me and I would be stupid to fork over more money!

  OK for those who need it – but neither I nor my friends have needed to rely on it to insure that we gain experience because we have been employed at quality firms. It is a good guide for those who need it, employees and employers alike, <u>but</u> it <u>should</u> <u>not</u> be <u>mandatory</u>!!!

- Even if I pass all the exams and have the 8 years required experience working for a licensed architect, I would be interested in at least a comprehensive seminar that would cover the 16 areas by which one could enroll to help acquire a comprehensive understanding of areas that may not have been covered on the job.

- Fees to architects might lead some professions to not providing opportunities for IDP. Adding these fees to exam fees makes the entire process that much more expensive and limits number of architects.

- An architect once licensed should be requalified on a regular basis, the effort should be shifted from IDP to relicensing/testing procedures!

- What if I work under the direct supervision of a US registered architect but the organization practices architecture outside the United States or Canada? Does the experience count as Category A of the training setting?

- IDP is expensive and hard to reach a "human" on the phone. Friends who have participated don't like it. If you need or want to travel to other states, does your record follow? Each person should educate themselves in their profession and not rely on an outside source to relieve them of this. If you decide to take time before completing licensure, you have to give out even more money. As you can tell, I don't like the idea and hope this program is not required.

- 10 years ago, I moved to California to work in architecture offices, with the intention of getting my license in this state. My degree is not in architecture, but I knew that with enough experience I could take the exams and obtain a license. I have currently passed three exams. Adopting IDP without grandfathering situations like mine will be a great disappointment to me. I have a wife and children and I'm not in a position to quit my job and go back to school for another degree. If CAB does decide to adopt IDP, I would like to be able to complete licensure requirements under the current system.

- I'm worried about how it affects my ability to take and pass just 1 exam left.

- The fees and time input requirements are absurd.
  I believe the IDP is an unnecessary program. I favor California's approach which allows persons, through a combination of work and school experience, to become a licensed architect. IDP has not provided any value to me as someone who has worked in the architectural profession for over 9 years. As I understand, IDP's regulations would not allow me to become a licensed architect. I do not understand why, if the ARE is standardized throughout the country and California architects are required to take an additional oral exam, there would be any problems with reciprocity in the other states. Seems like this is more a political issue with IDP/NCARB than anything else.

- It sucks and it is poorly explained. It also is way too expensive.

- In theory, I believe IDP is a great idea; it is, however, too difficult to process. What if your firm does not do marketing, how do you fulfill that? If you don't, does that really make you less of an architect, maybe less of a business person, but you might still be an excellent architect. The people who planned the divisions and rules clearly did not have to figure out how to track it.

- I have heard stories that IDP candidates are not honest when filling out their forms and their employers don't care, which is very unfair to others who are honest. Also, employers only care about getting their own needs met and don't want to schedule their employees to gain experience in all 16 training areas. My past employer just signed my forms without even reviewing them.